

The Philanthropist.

JAMES G. BIRNEY, EDITOR.

We are verily guilty concerning our brother *** therefore, is this distress come upon us.

A. PUGH, PRINTER.

VOLUME 1.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, FRIDAY, MAY 20, 1836.

NUMBER 21.

THE PHILANTHROPIST

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT
CINCINNATI, OHIO.
BY THE OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
(Publishing Room, corner of Seventh and Main Sts.)

Two Dollars per annum, always payable in advance.
Letters and Communications on business of the Office
should be directed to AUGUSTUS WATLES. Those
relating to the Editorial Department to the Editor of the
Philanthropist. In all cases post-paid.
Names of Counties should be particularly mentioned in
giving directions for sending the paper.
An Advertisement making one square or less, will be
inserted three times for one dollar.

SLAVERY.

Speech of Gerrit Smith, Esq.

The following manly and eloquent effort will be read with delight by every friend of free institutions, and of republican liberty. It was delivered under these circumstances:—The Oneida Manual Labor Institute, had been established at Whitesboro' for the education of young men who were unable to defray the expenses of attending a literary institution, without, at the same time laboring with their hands. In common with other institutions erected for the advancement of learning, it had received some assistance from the State. For the time it has been in operation, it has sent out more young men of rare intellectual endowments, of independent thought, and of untiring zeal for human good, than any other in our land. In obedience to southern dictation—of which the Governor became the supple and willing instrument, the legislature of N. Y. was called on, to aid in sustaining the "domestic institutions of slavery at the south," at the expense of the institutions of liberty at the north. The first assault was made by the Senate—and this too, on the institution at Whitesboro'—peculiarly the institution of the poor—by attempting to withdraw from it the aid it had been accustomed to receive from the State. In this state of things, the friends of the institution, in the county of Oneida, met at Utica on the 27th April last, for the purpose of adopting such measures as would be proper for its support. The sum of nearly five THOUSAND dollars was subscribed by those present.

The conduct of the New-York Senate, adds another proof to the many already existing, that, servility in performing its loathsome offices, ever delights in assailing the weak. Before an antagonist that has strength, that wields power, it has always shown itself a contemptible and quailing recreant.

If, at any time, the liberties of our country be entirely lost, this event will be preceded by the ignorance and degradation of the poor. The means of education will not be supplied—or, if they have been, they will be taken away by those who wish to be their masters. The minds of the poor will be suffered to remain dark and comfortless and unenlightened—that they may have neither the intelligence to know, nor the spirit to maintain their rights. When the master of a thousand crouching heathen shall be enabled to say, with truth, what he now says falsely—that his chained slaves are happier and more respectable than the honest yeomen of the free states, however poor—then, indeed not only shall the slavery of the south be perpetual, but the slavery of the north shall make another "corner stone of this republican edifice."

But there is ground of hope—enough to cheer every friend of liberty, and urge him on to mightier effort. God's blessing is still with those who are contending in his fear, for the inalienable rights of their fellow men—every day bears witness to fresh triumphs of the truth, and to the rapid re-animation of the spirit of freedom.

The following resolutions among others were considered at the meeting.

Resolved, That the recent attempt in our Legislature to diminish the pecuniary resources, and to tarnish the character of Oneida Institute, on the ground that its officers and students vote as they please, and embrace a religion, which pronounces slavery to be a sin, is not only a dangerous infringement of our political compact, but a daring and wicked invasion of God's moral government.

Resolved, That we have most alarming proof, that the press is under the baneful influence of slavery, and its twin brother aristocracy, in the fact of its profound silence respecting the attack in our Legislature on Oneida Institute, a school which was established especially for youth in humble life, and which has the honesty and courage to set itself against the abominations of slavery.

Resolved, That it requires no effort to prove that had Oneida Institute favored the aristocrats' darling institution of slavery, or had it been a school for the sons of the wealthy and fashionable, instead of the coarse clad and hard-handed sons of honest poverty, it would not have fallen under the vengeance of our Legislature.

GERRIT SMITH, Esq. said, if the Roman Emperor's mind was so big with a sense of the importance of the destruction of Carthage to his country's welfare, as to cause him to introduce into all his speeches, on whatever occasion, on whatever subject, made, his famous *Carthago delenda est*, then it is not strange if the abolitionist should exclaim, both in season and out of season, "Slavery must be destroyed." Whatever the interests of his country on which this old Roman was called to speak, this earnest, and upmost thought—the necessary destruction of Carthage—must have vent. And somewhat so it is coming to be with us. Are we called to contemplate the precious political and religious institutions of our beloved nation, and the happy bearing of their example on the other nations of the earth, if we but remain an undivided people, and illustrate the excellence of those institutions in our good conduct and prosperity—is our attention called to our rail roads and canals and schools; to the various developments of our enterprise and resources; to our commerce, vexing every sea, and searching out every people—to the abundant rewards of laborious, honest tillage—to the fresh and beautiful villages and cities rapidly studing the whole

length and breadth of our land—how soon does the patriotic and heartfelt joy, which springs up in us on these occasions, meet with the withering thought, that slavery is in the land; and how ready are we to exclaim, in this revulsion of our feelings, that slavery must be destroyed!

When on the 21st October last, more than five hundred men—eminently peaceable and inoffensive men—were driven from this temple of the living God by an infuriate mob—when we saw with our own eyes how completely this mob was at the beck and service of men high in office and strong in influence—when we looked in vain for the police of the city to come to our rescue—when we inquired in vain for the friends of law amongst this hitherto law-abiding people—when it was to no purpose, that we asked where were the hospitable, the pious, the pitiful, the courteous of the city, in this season of the distress of their guests, and of the peril of their brethren's lives, and when we could distinctly trace this outrage upon our rights and interests, and this deep disgrace of a city hitherto distinguished for the virtues of its citizens, to the actings of slavery on the selfishness of the human heart—I ask, did we not feel, as we never felt before, that slavery must be destroyed? And when we have since heard of similar scenes, and especially of that very similar one in Boston, in which numbers of the mob—if I may use the expression—boasted that they were "gentlemen of standing and property," I ask again did not the feeling in our breasts, that slavery must be destroyed wax strong?

Since the odious and terrific exhibition of slavery on the 21st October last, there have been abundant manifestations of that power in our national and state councils. It has not spared even the venerable Chief Magistrate of the nation; but has made him disgrace himself in his old age. It polluted his last annual message with falsehoods, and made that document the vehicle of slanders against some of the purest men in the land. Nor is its power on the minds of the Governors of our States, as indicated in their messages, less remarkable. For instance, Governor McDuffie calls slavery, "the corner stone of the republican edifice;" and he recommends it to the people of the northern states, as an institution eminently worthy of being adopted by them. He unites with Senator Leigh, of Virginia, and Mr. Pickens of Carolina, and other southern statesmen, in recommending the white fingered gentlemen of the north, to strip their hard knuckled yeomanry—their farmers and mechanics—of all political rights and to turn them into slaves. I fancy some honest laborer within the sound of my voice exclaims, "when the aristocrats of the north undertake that job, they will have their hands full." That slavery should lead Gov. McDuffie to believe himself and his fellow slaveholders to be patriots, and that he should so complacently take his seat by the side of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, is a proof of its power over the imagination scarcely less ludicrous than painful.

But as we are citizens of the State of New York, we are more interested to learn what slavery has done and is doing in her councils. And, in the first place, it did a work for our Governor to do—and it made him do it. We often hear about the devil standing at the elbow of certain people. Now it is easy to fancy that Slavery stood at our Governor's elbow, when he wrote the last message; and it is easy to fancy the dialogue which passed between them.—"Write," says slavery, "that there will be a gag law enacted, unless people stop talking against me; for know that I never allow myself to be spoken of but in terms of praise." "I cannot write that," says the Governor, "for it is settled by the terms of our Government that the freedom of speech and of the press cannot be abridged." "A fig for your Government!"—says slavery: "have not my mobs in Utica, and Boston, and elsewhere, and my whippings and murders of abolitionists at the south, taught you, that I am stronger than the Government? Upon this the poor Governor writes what is dictated to him. "Write now," says slavery, "that the abolitionists are invading the constitution, and attempting to ruin the nation." Here again the Governor records the glaring falsehoods; not, however, without a slight suffusion of the cheek—just enough to show that conscience is not entirely extinct.—"Write now," says slavery, "that you know the abolitionists to be a pack of wicked, worthless fellows, small in number, and rapidly becoming smaller." At this the Governor bolts outright—exclaiming, that he will do this dirty business no longer—that his dictator must tell his own falsehoods, and that he will not be guilty of the self-degradation of telling them for him. The demon's eyes flash new terrors, and his voice assumes the energy of his great master of the pit. "Know then," he exclaims, "that if not in the semi-slave region of the north, yet, in the slave states proper, I reign supreme, and that their presidential vote is as surely mine, as if I carried it in my breeches pocket—and know too, that none can be benefited by that vote, who refuse to fall down and worship me." The Governor's bristles are now all fallen, and his courage which for a moment, promised something better, now utterly expires. "Command me," says the affrighted, humbled man, "as you will—only don't, don't deprive the 'republican party,' of the vote of the south."

When we see the power of slavery, as in this instance, over a man justly esteemed for his uncommonly vigorous and highly cultivated mind, I ask you in soberness, do we not feel that it is time that slavery was destroyed?

Allow me, sir, to digress for a moment to a subject, which on an occasion like the present, is apt to be unwelcome and offensive; I mean the subject of myself. What I have just been saying may occasion the remark, that I have been speaking for political effect—to advantage one of our political parties, and to disparage the other. But let it be borne in mind, that, if I have given you in Gov. Marcy a specimen of a Jackson or Van Buren man, I have also shown you a whig in Gov. McDuffie.

I am not ignorant, that a portion of the political press, for the purpose of counteracting and destroying the little influence I might otherwise have in the glorious cause in which we are embarked, impeaches my motives, and condemns them as the base designs of a demagogue. Our state paper calls me "the abolition and temperance demagogue." Now, sir, who ever heard of a demagogue, that attacked the giant vices of his countrymen? Who ever heard of a demagogue, that sought to corrupt the public heart, and to win its favor, by attacking the public vices? Surely he must be a demagogue sui generis. If I were not the person in question I would say—give us more such demagogues—more vice-attacking demagogues—more of the demagogues, who labor amidst clouds of reproach and storms of wrath, to purify the country of the pollutions of intemperance, and to relieve millions of their countrymen from the yoke of bondage.

Since I am upon this strain of egotism, let me say a few words on my politics.—There have been a few periods in my life, when I was somewhat of a political partizan. Such periods there may be a

gain.—Improbable as it is, that I shall ever be a politician again, I will not cut myself off by any promises secret or published, that I will never hereafter be a politician. But to show you how utterly groundless is the attempt of the State paper, and its affiliated presses to prejudice your precious cause through the sides of my humble self, by holding me up, week after week, and day after day, as an aspiring politician, and even a political leader, I state to you, that since the year 1828, I have not been in a political meeting;—that since that year I have not written a political article;—and, that the aggregate of the time, I have spent at the polls of election since that year does not exceed five minutes. And let me add that when I have voted since the year 1828, which, I am almost ashamed to say, I have not always been careful to do; the composition of my vote has not invariably been satisfactory to either party.

But, sir, I know not what I or any other abolitionists has to hope for from either of the political parties. They are endeavoring to surpass each other in their abuse and vilification of us, I rejoice, that the abolitionists are expelled from both of the political parties; and, I trust, that we shall continue to stand by ourselves—fully determined never to blend and pollute our holy cause with party schemes—but always to trust to its intrinsic power and the blessing of God upon it for its perfect and glorious success.

To return from this digression—what is the condition of the political press of this State?—muzzled by slavery! Deny it who will, the political press of this State is muzzled by Slavery. Not a dozen newspapers in this State dare to speak out against Slavery; whilst almost all of them are ready to offer apologies for the abomination, and many of them to speak in high praises of it. Sir, it is possible, that we can look on these things, and not feel that slavery must be destroyed? How stood the political press of this country in relation to the scenes of the 21st of October? Was it faithful to the great cause of civil liberty? To the sacred cause of human rights? No, it was not. It was most treacherously unfaithful. Why, Sir, if I am not misinformed, the public have never known to this day from the political press of this country, that there was a mob in this city the 21st Oct. last, or that any thing was done by the people of Utica between sunrise and sunset on that memorable day, which they have good cause to regret. Had but a single slaveholder—and in appeal to the candor of every hearer for the truth of what I say—had but a single slaveholder been insulted in the streets of this city, on that day, for his slaveholding, the press of this country would have been trumpet-tongued to avenge him; and rightly too, exclaiming our deep seated respect for law and right;—but because the five hundred men driven from this temple, were the enemies of slavery, the press observes a profound silence about the enormity, and thereby sanctions it.

Let us now, sir, turn our attention to the proceedings, which occasioned the call of this meeting, to see in them a further argument for the necessary destruction of slavery. Our Senate have undertaken to regulate the political and moral complexion of the members of our schools. The Constitution of the State allows them to vote on the bare qualifications of age and residence; but our Senate, raising itself above the Constitution, threatens to limit this right to those of them, who will vote for what it is pleased to call "the republican party." The Constitution guarantees religious freedom; but our Senate, in defiance of this instrument, threatens to outlaw the religion, which adjudges slavery to be a sin. Had the Oneida Institute generally leaned to this "republican party," and had its system of ethics been such as justifies slavery, it would never have been taken in hand by the Senate.

But it is asked, is slavery to blame for these proceedings of our Senate? Yes, it is, these proceedings are manifestly a sacrificial offering to that Demon. The South insisted, that the authorities of the free States should manifest their respect for the venerable, and, as Gov. McDuffie call it, patriarchal institution of slavery. Our Governor was quick to respond to the claim; and our Legislature was looked to "to follow suit" and to enact a gag law. But it prudently paused, fearing that this would be prostituting the South to too dear a rate. Though in such a game, the "republican party" might perhaps draw a few small southern prizes, it was far more probable, that it would draw some fatal Southern blanks. The conclusion was, that the enactment of a gag law should not be risked; that the joint committee should not report one; but that they should do no more than to report a series of resolutions abusing and black-balling the abolitionists in customary style, and as a matter of course, extolling the "chivalry" and "domestic institutions" of the South. These resolutions, together with the Governor's Message, were to appease the South, and she was to receive them in exchange for her far greater claims. It was however, thought advisable, in order to render the satisfaction of the South more sure, to make a legislative pro-slavery dash at the Oneida Institute. I admire the cunning, which was displayed in the selection of this school.—Had it been a school of an ordinary character, not even the incubus of slavery, which presses upon the whole length and breadth of the State, could have restrained the general expression of indignation at this outrage. But they selected a school of a peculiar character—the first manual labor school ever established in our country—a school which is emphatically the poor boy's school, and one, where to use the language of the Resolutions before you, the coarse-clad and hard-handed sons of honest poverty may have an opportunity to improve their minds. And here, sir, I lay it down as a general truth, that, whenever slavery is in the ascendant, as it now is, the laboring poor, and the provisions made for their improvement, are sneered at and attacked with comparative impunity. As a proof of this, there is not, I believe, a single political newspaper in this State, that has raised its voice against this outrage upon Oneida Institute. But, had a similar attack been made on Union College, or Columbia College, or some other resort of the sons of the wealthy and fashionable, the whole editorial corps of our State would have been prompt to avenge the injury. They selected a school prominent for its opposition to slavery, and intemperance, and lewdness, and the other prevalent vices of our country. They knew that the combination of manual labor with study, was not yet so general in our country, as to be popular.—They knew too of the odium, which rested on efforts to abolish slavery, and to advance the principles of that thorough temperance which is advocated in the Oneida Institute. Here then, sir, was a school so weak in the public sympathy, that its assailants would have nothing to fear from its insignificant avengers; and they would get as much credit with the South for the blow they aimed at this school, as they would, had they aimed it at Union College, or at some other Seminary, which had struck its roots wide and deep in the popular favor, and was, therefore, able to return, and with interest too, any injustice it might receive, from

whatever source. I ask you again, sir, is it not time, that, slavery should be destroyed? Can we witness these exertions of its power over the minds of our legislators, and not feel that it is high time, it should be destroyed?

But, sir, why have I been detaining you with this comparatively insignificant exhibition of the fearful power and bitter fruits of slavery? Why did I not tell you in the beginning, in abundant proof that slavery must be destroyed, that its ponderous iron heel is already on the necks of more than two millions of its bleeding victims; that it has stripped them of all the dear and sacred rights of man; and that it impudently and blasphemously says to God—these millions of your rational creatures shall never be permitted to know you, and the homage of their hearts you shall never have. But again I say, why did I not tell you in the beginning, in abundant proof, that slavery must be destroyed, that the Demon is at this moment artfully and powerfully busy in stretching out his dominion over immense regions of the South-west; and, that, until he is destroyed and driven from our country, no part of it—not even that where our 'lines have fallen,' will be secure against coming into entire subjection to his power.

Slavery, sir, must be destroyed. But then follows the question, how shall it be destroyed? I answer by continuing to employ, unflinchingly and perseveringly, the same means substantially, which we have hitherto employed—by an honest and fearless and yet kind exhibition of the truth. Truth, sir, is the Luther's spear, which has started up the monster, and shown his huge dimensions and mighty power. Let us continue to pour the light of truth into his dark and filthy den, until he shall be distinctly seen in his true character, when he will be as universally hated. What, if under this stream, his rage do swell, and his contortions increase, they will only serve to make him more manifest, and to draw upon him speedier and more fatal vengeance.

On the present occasion, sir, we have a special duty to perform in aid of the sacred cause of anti-slavery. The providence of God affords us an eminently favorable opportunity to attest the sincerity of our devotion to this cause. By extending a helping hand to the school which has fallen under slavery's vengeance, we shall be giving good proof of our appreciation of the great principles of that cause. These principles the Oneida Institute has had the courage and the honesty to espouse. With these principles, hated, yet beautiful—persecuted, but one day triumphant and glorious—she has even dared to identify herself. She has made common cause with them, and nobly determined, that their fate shall be hers. What shall this helping hand be? If we should do nothing in this Convention for Oneida Institute, I doubt not that some benefit would, nevertheless, accrue to it from the bare fact that the Convention was held. If we should pass resolutions expressive of our confidence in its religious principles, and in the wisdom, and learning, and purity of its teachers, still more would it be benefited. But, if we should avail ourselves of this opportunity to impart liberally to it of our substance, unspeakably more would it be benefited. In this wise, sir, we should be rendering timely aid to an institution, which must look for its means of support chiefly, under God, to persons of our views of truth and duty. In this wise, too, we should be encouraging other schools to cut loose from the moorings of expediency and worldly policy, and to put out upon the broad ocean of truth—to dismiss their fears of losing patronage by the change; and to trust to God to raise up for them new friends, who shall be worth as much more than the old ones from whom they parted, as their new principles are better than those which they repudiated.

In conclusion, sir, our coming up liberally to the aid of the Oneida Institute at this crisis of her fortunes, will teach the enemies of the cause of anti-slavery, how vain it is for them to persecute it; and that every blow it is for them to aim at that sacred cause, is a signal for its prompt defenders to rally around it with new zeal and courage and self sacrifices.

Texas.

BY DAVID LEE CHILD, ESQ.
(Concluded.)

In the beginning of 1833, to relieve themselves from their apprehensions, they held a convention at St. Felipe de Austin, to form a Constitution for the new State of Texas, separate from Coahuila. This convention, in point of form, was not agreeable to law. They proceeded, however, to form a constitution, and commissioned Mr. Stephen F. Austin to proceed to Mexico and request a ratification of it, and the admission of the proposed State into the Mexican Union. This Mr. Austin is the son of Moses Austin, originally of Connecticut, to whom the royal government had granted a large and fine tract of land in the central part of Texas. He died without effecting much towards possessing and enjoying the grant; but this son, above mentioned, having obtained from the republican government of Mexico a confirmation to him of the grant to his father, commenced a settlement under better auspices, which has become the leading one in the colony. The Mexican Congress rejected the application of the Texans for several reasons, but principally because they considered the object to be to establish and perpetuate slavery, contrary to the national constitution, and contrary to that of the State, which prohibits slavery and the introduction of slaves under any pretence whatever. The proposed constitution contained no provision on that subject! Upon the failure of his mission, Austin wrote to the municipal authorities in Texas, urging them to proclaim the new constitution in spite of the general government. Without doubt he desired to precipitate the province into a rebellion for the desperate chance of obtaining thereby the blessings of slavery. The Ayuntamiento of Bejar, upon receipt of Austin's communication, adopted a declaration censuring him for it, and ordered the whole subject to be referred with the documents to the governor of Coahuila and Texas, and he immediately passed them to the President of the Mexican States. Meantime Austin had left the capital to proceed homeward, but he was overtaken by a messenger of the government and arrested in the town of Saltillo on the frontiers of Texas and Coahuila, and brought back to the city. This was the occasion of that imprisonment of Austin which has elicited so much sympathy in his favor from the press of the United States. How little he merited it, this narrative sufficiently shows. It is now necessary to look to the movements of our government. The river Sabine is the boundary between Mexico and the United States established by the Florida treaty in 1819. That treaty, if not mainly intended to gratify Georgia, was undoubtedly much hastened on her account. It was recently sent by a member of Congress of that day, a gentleman opposed to abolition,* that in a secret session of the House of Representatives on the subject of that treaty, it was stated that the Presi-

dent, Monroe, had received more than a hundred and fifty letters from inhabitants of Georgia, residing near the Florida line, declaring that their slaves ran away in such numbers, and found an asylum in Florida, that if the province were not obtained by treaty, the Georgians would rise and take it by force. We pass the melancholy subject of the robbery of the aborigines.

Florida was obtained, but scarcely was peaceable possession taken of it, when a longing eye was cast upon Texas. Mr. Adams, a northern President, accused by the slaveholders of having sacrificed a good claim on Texas to obtain Florida, because he was jealous of the slave-states, gave way to this grasping disposition and sent a Minister Plenipotentiary, Mr. Poinsett of South Carolina, to Mexico with instructions to purchase Texas, if it could be had; and if zeal, intrigue, and taking every advantage of the intestine divisions of the country could have ensured a favorable result, there cannot be a doubt that Mr. Poinsett would have obtained the land, and 'five more slave states,' would have now been in rapid process of preparation for brightening the North American constellation. Fortunately, there was nothing accomplished in Mr. Adams' time, in which there was certainly the most danger, from his wary and experienced diplomacy. Gen. Jackson having succeeded to the Presidency, sent off new and pressing instructions to Poinsett, in consequence of which that minister appears to have pulled the wires with an intensity, till then unknown.—Then it was that his house was beset by a mob, and the American flag unfurled to protect our minister from their fury. It was duly honored by the Mexicans, and we would fain say as much of the American side of the affair. It was reported at home that Poinsett was assassinated. He had made himself the master-mover among the Yorkinos, or York Masons, a political party under the name of Freemasonry.

The Mexican people, as well as every administration for the last eight or ten years, have been not only opposed to the sale of Texas, but sorely sensitive on the subject. Their national constitution defines the limits of the national domain. These could not be altered without an alteration of the constitution. The Mexicans resented the idea of a foreigner's proposing an object, which could not be reached without breaking down and trampling upon their constitution. When it was found that they would not sell Texas, Mr. Poinsett taking advantage of an approaching invasion and of the supposed exhaustion of the treasury, proposed to loan them the sum of \$10,000,000 upon a mortgage of Texas. The Mexicans considered this a farther and grosser insult.

In the latter part of the year 1829, Poinsett was recalled, and all the information respecting these remarkable transactions, which the President has thought proper to give, or any member of Congress to call for, was a declaration in the message of that year, that the imputations upon Poinsett of interference in the political concerns of Mexico, were believed to be groundless! Mr. Poinsett left Mexico amidst the general execrations of the people and government.

A Charge de Affaires, Col. Butler, was sent to replace him, but we understand that he has never ventured openly to propose a renewal of the negotiation. In the year 1831, it had come to be well understood in the United States, that all hope of taking Texas by diplomacy was at an end. But it was said by the Southern presses, and evidently with the sanction, if not at the suggestion of official persons, that the Texans would one day declare themselves independent, and ask to be received into the union.

It remains now to advert briefly to the source of this extreme impatience for the annexation of Texas to our country, already so extensive. This source is deeper than mere covetousness of territory.

Slave labor ruins in a course of time every soil in the planting countries except those rare spots, which possess by nature an inexhaustible fertility. The planters know no such process as manuring. The maritime parts of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina are described as barren and desolate for nearly one hundred miles into the interior. Where once there was cultivation and stately mansions, are now stunted pines; and the wolf and the wild deer have literally returned to their primitive haunts. The business of planting, properly so called, is run out, and as farming never has borne, and never can bear, to any great extent, the expense of slave labor; the owners of slaves in the old states find themselves equally embarrassed by an impoverished soil, and a surplus of laborers. The latter rapidly increases, and new mouths are added in proportion as the means are diminished for filling them. In this state of things the planter would be compelled to emancipate or starve in the midst of his vassals. And here comes in the American slave trade, like a guardian genius, from the regions of despair, to relieve criminals from the natural consequences of their crime, from the correctional police, established in mercy by the Ruler of the universe. It comes to turn sins into gold, and to diminish the number of mouths while it increases the means of satisfying them.

Hence the fact, that Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, had become before the year 1830, slave-exporting states, and some of them slave-raising states, i. e. making it a business to breed slaves for the market. Mr. Marshall, a member of the Virginia assembly, estimated the number raised and sold by that state, between the years 1820 and 1830, at 108,000; which were worth, at a moderate calculation \$32,400,000. During the same period, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Kentucky, exported as many more. This, therefore, is an interest fearfully great and increasing. Georgia, Tennessee, and even Missouri, may now be added to the list, according to information which is reaching us from these states.

It is obvious that this immense amount of human merchandise, this 'virginal crop,' as it was denominated by Mr. Faulkner, in the Virginia assembly, must find a market; and there is no place on the globe, where Americans, who, by the law of God, and by that covenant with Him, which we have forsaken, should all be born free, can be sold like cattle, except within the limits of our own republic. It becomes necessary, therefore, for the support of this mighty iniquity, that a home market should be provided.

It is well known throughout the slave-holding country, that it is the uniform policy of the slave states to stop the importation of slaves from other states, as soon as they are in a situation to dispense with the supply from that source. The most high spirited and dangerous slaves, and those who have committed crimes, are commonly transported to the slave-importing states as a punishment. There is therefore a tendency to bring together in those states, a dangerous mass of materials for insurrection. Accordingly all the states, except Louisiana, have now excluded the trade. They do permit persons moving into their limits for the purpose of re-aiding, to bring their slaves, but none for the purpose of sale. In 1831, Louisiana passed a similar prohibition, but repealed it in 1833, in consequence

it was said of the ravages of the cholera. It is well understood throughout the south, that within the present limits of the United States, the slave trade, must soon cease, except the few sales and exchanges which took place in the vicinage. When this time comes, be it sooner or be it later, whether the Sabine or the Pacific shall form the barrier, the slave empire in this republic must come to an end; for when the planters, and the makers of man-made chattel shall be unable to sell it, they must emancipate or massacre. Either way slavery, which is worse than death, would cease. But to this alternative the slave-holders do not intend, without the most desperate efforts to be driven. The propensity for slave-holding, engendered by education and example, is strengthened by the strongest evils of our nature, as pride, love of power, love of ease, pleasure and personal consequence, and the corrupting and searing influence of vicious habits. Those are all enlisted to perpetuate slavery, and therefore to procure the annexation to the slaveholding southwest of an extensive, rich and lovely land, large enough for five more slave states. The southern press, beginning with a series of essays by Thomas H. Benton, has called loudly and unanimously for the annexation, on some terms and by some means, during the last six years. Many times has it openly avowed the object of increasing the preponderance and security of the slave interest in the union. It is worthy of a passing notice that Benton's essays were commenced just about the time that Jackson's first instructions were despatched to Poinsett. Samuel Houston an intimate friend, and protégé of the President, was noted by a number of presses six years ago, as having gone to Texas for the purpose of revolutionizing it. Could a better hand than he be found for executing the schemes of a Benton, the principal author of the extension of slavery to Missouri, and the prime plotter of the present movement in Texas. Houston now re-appears, in the public papers, collecting troops, sending expresses to the President of the United States; and tempting every catfish in the country by offering to parcel out the beautiful domain of the Mexican nation among those who shall assist in perpetrating robbery and perpetrating the slave-trade and slavery. It has been quaintly said of distinguished personage, that he offered to give away all the kingdoms of the earth, when the poor devil did not own a foot of it!

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, MAY 20, 1836.

Offer to the M. E. Conference—Rejected.

To the Gen. Conference of M. E. Church:—

In the Philanthropist—of which the undersigned is editor—there will be published, this week, a sketch of your late debate on Slavery. Should it be agreeable to your body, fifty copies of it, or more, will, on publication be sent to the Conference room, without charge, for the use of its members.

Very Respectfully,

JAMES G. BIRNEY.

Cincinnati, Thursday Morning, May 19, '36.

We are sorry to report, that the above offer, made in the spirit of kindness, met with a very unsuitable response from the body to which it was directed. On the reading of the Note, by the presiding officer, some members—we are not informed, who, and we were not present—moved to lay it on the table. This was carried, as it were, by acclamation. Mr. Rozzell remarking, that he regretted, this motion was made, as he had intended to move, that the writer have leave to withdraw his note.

Notwithstanding what has passed, any member of the Conference can be supplied with a number of the Philanthropist, containing the Debate, by making known to us his desire to have it.

Debate on Slavery and Abolition.

We give, to day, a sketch of the debate on slavery, which took place, last week, in the General Conference of the M. E. Church. This is the highest judicature, (to use a word which is becoming quite common among us, in relation to such matters,) of a denomination, which numbers more than six hundred thousand members in this country alone. This sketch, we doubt not, imperfect as it may be, will prove more acceptable to our readers, than any thing else, with which our columns could, at this time, be filled. It is only what it professes to be—a sketch: whilst it does not pretend to give throughout, the precise language used by the speakers—though this in many of the most interesting passages, is accurately preserved—it yet presents, in the main, as far as it goes, a faithful outline of the facts and arguments that were advanced. We say, as far as it goes—for on reviewing what we have prepared, we know, that some of them have been overlooked. To such, and also to others, that we may possibly hereafter recall, we may, on some future occasion, revert. Of one thing, however, we feel quite sure—that, in no instance, has there been intentionally given; any exaggeration to behavior and expressions, on the part of the slave-holding speakers, that to us appeared fierce and reprehensible. We say, on the part of the slave-holding speakers—for, so far as the assailed acted, we have, on no other occasion, so critical, and delicate, seen men act with a steadier regard to christian dignity and decorum. Yet, if our account does wrong to any of the speakers, all we require, to rectify it, is—to be informed that the wrong exists. It will give us pleasure, not only to correct any material error, which may be pointed out to us, but to publish a fuller report of any of the speeches with which the gentlemen delivering them may furnish us.

The whole transaction is portentous to the true prosperity of the Church, in which it occurred. In recalling it, it seems almost like a dream. Would not Wesley have regarded it as a fore-running slander—as the foul suggestion of the wicked one, had it been prophesied to him, on his death bed, that, in less than fifty years from his departure, those who profess to follow him, as he followed Christ, would cast so black a reproach, on his memory, and inflict so deep a wound on a cause that was dear to him through life? Can there be any proof more convincing, of the Boa-Constrictor strength of the sin of slavery, than to see a whole Church, possessing the power, that it is undeniable, the Methodist Church once possessed with God, struck with terror by its fierce glance—sickening under its pestilential effluvia, and ready to fall, a helpless, fear-stricken victim into its crushing and suffocating folds? Surely, mightier efforts on the part of those who see and feel aright, on the sin and the evil of slavery, are, more than ever, demanded in the present crisis. And what can there be, that should more loudly summon to the rescue, the noblest energies of the republican-christian, than to see the largest denomination in the land—acting under an organization of

iron strength—capable, from its compactness, of wielding mighty faculties, either to attack or to defend and with the force and precision too of the Macedonian phalanx—deliberately making a covenant with the oppressor of the poor, and extending over him, the broad shield of its protection, from any further disturbance in his heaven-daring iniquity.

Notwithstanding the present aspect of things, we will not, for a single moment, yield to the desponding influences, which such conduct in itself has a tendency to create. No: We doubt not, good—real good—will, in some way, come out of it. There are in the M. E. Church, thousands who walk in faith and prevail in prayer. They must be alarmed at the conduct of their leaders—and, if nothing better can be done, they will reject their further guidance. Indeed, every day brings to us fresh proof, creating in us fresh distrust, of the efficiency of large ecclesiastical organizations to promote the cause of true piety. They have strength—but, we fear, it is not the strength of religious principle;—they have wisdom, but is there not reason to suspect that it is the wisdom of the world—of a party, and not that which is from above?

These remarks are not intended to hold up to invidious distinction the M. E. Church—they are intended equally to apply to all others, whose organization authorizes their application. We count it of but little moment, by what name among christians, the cause of human righteousness, and human happiness, is marred. It is always to be lamented. Of as little account do we regard it, by what name it is advanced. It is ever to be rejoiced at. Our humble praise shall always follow it.

Pro-Slavery Ecclesiastics.

General Conference—Methodist Episcopal Church.

Discussion on Slavery.

May 12. This morning, Mr. Rozzell, of the Baltimore Conference, introduced (with some slight amendments,) the following preamble and resolutions. "Whereas great excitement has pervaded this country on the subject of modern abolitionism, which is reported to have been increased in this city recently, by the unjustifiable conduct of two members of the General Conference, in lecturing upon, and in favor of that agitating topic;—and whereas, such a course on the part of any of its members is calculated to bring upon this body the suspicion and distrust of the community, and misrepresent its sentiments in regard to the point at issue;—and whereas, in this aspect of the case, a due regard for its own character, as well as a just concern for the interests of the church confided to its care, demand a full, decided and unequivocal expression of the views of the General Conference in the premises—Therefore,

1. Resolved, by the delegates of the annual Conference in General Conference assembled, that they disapprove in the most unqualified sense, the conduct of the two members of the General Conference, who are reported to have lectured in this city recently, upon and in favor of modern abolitionism.

2. Resolved, by the delegates of the annual Conference in General Conference assembled—that they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism, and wholly disclaim any right, wish or intention, to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave as it exists in the slaveholding States of this Union,

[The following statement will serve to explain the particular occasion which gave rise to the first resolution. A regular weekly meeting of the Cincinnati A. S. Society was held on the preceding Tuesday evening. At this, Mr. Rozzell, of New England, members of the General Conference, and well known as abolitionists, were present. They, each, made some remarks which were very well received—and the result was the addition of fifteen members to the Society.—Ed. PHIL.]

The character of the resolutions, the circumstance, which occasioned them, together with the stern gravity of Mr. Rozzell, produced no little excitement. "The blood of the southrons was up," as the phrase is. Many violent denunciatory things were said by them, which, inasmuch as we have no notes we shall not attempt to repeat. Some amendments were proposed. One moved by Mr. Wright, Book Agent of the Church in Cincinnati, was, that the number of the individuals alluded to in the preamble be specified, that the public might see to how small an extent the Conference was chargeable with such conduct.—His amendment was adopted and the number two inserted. Still, the delicacy of the Conference was unsatisfied; more was to be done to conciliate public favor, and clear itself from so odious an act. Somebody—we are unable to name the person—moved that the first resolution should be amended, by inserting the names of the guilty individuals—much discussion ensued hereupon. It was thought by some, that such a measure, if adopted, would subject the offending brethren to no little danger. Their persons might be assailed—lynch law put in operation. It was at all events needlessly severe. Others insisted that, the Conference should be relieved entirely from the odium of such conduct—that public censure should be located just where it was merited—that the individuals themselves, would, no doubt, feel honored by such notoriety, &c.—Rev. Mr. Saurin, of the Philadelphia Conference, was, if we remember aright, particularly desirous that this amendment should be passed. Rev. Mr. Smith, of Richmond, Virginia, advocated it strenuously. This gentleman rose under great excitement and spoke most vehemently. We remember explicitly one of his sayings—uttered with sounding emphasis. Speaking of the propriety of designating the offending brethren—"Let them," said he, "be brought forth in all the length and breadth of their DAMNING INIQUITY."

The amendment was lost, we believe, by a considerable majority.

The Conference after agreeing to hold an extra session at three in the afternoon, adjourned. All the while the resolutions were under discussion, great excitement prevailed. Speakers were abundant, two or three claiming the floor at the same time; and no space was left for the brethren accused, much less for a single abolitionist, to speak a word.

The Conference met agreeably to order in the afternoon, and the same scene was enacted for the space, we believe, of an hour or more; when, at length, Rev. Mr. Scott, of the New England Delegation, obtained the floor. We forbore taking any notes of this gentleman's speech.—There were no less than four several attempts or more, to put him down, by out-of-place calls to order, but he was each time sustained by the chair. We cannot fail to express our admiration of the coolness and self-possession of Mr. Scott, under so vexatious and embarrassing circumstances.

Afternoon Session.

After the reading of the resolutions and the amendments which had been offered in the morning—

Mr. Light, of Missouri, moved to refer the whole to a Committee, to report in the morning. He thought the

proceedings in which they were engaged were of great importance—that they ought to be acted upon, without undue excitement. He thought the state of feeling already too high for that deliberate action which was called for. He knew of brethren, who had made up their opinions on abolition—who would be willing to speak out on it boldly in its condemnation, who yet could not subscribe to every expression of the resolution.

Mr. Leigh, of Va. opposed the reference. He feared that more time would be consumed in arguing this incidental motion than ought to be consumed on the main question.

Mr. Grant, of N. Y. was in favor of the reference. It was too late to say, there were not two sides to this question. The abolitionists had unhappily taken that, which was most effectual for the disturbance of the church.—He had made it daily the subject of earnest prayer. He yet believed, that some means satisfactory and safe could be adopted.—He could not find it in his heart to grind the abolitionists down. He was not disposed to say they were less honest than himself—or, he than they. He had, also, a good opinion of the brethren from the slaveholding states. It would be no advantage to the brethren in the slaveholding states, to have the questioned determined in the manner contemplated by the resolutions, or to wound the feelings of the brethren from the north. It was, by far, the most important measure, that had ever been before the General Conference. He desired, it should be settled, so that there should be produced an entire reciprocity of feeling in the members living in the north and south. He could not suppose, that any thing else was desirable to the brethren. He said this in reference to the twofold cause of excitement known to exist. First the misrepresentations which had been made of the south, in the treatment of their slaves, and the manner in which slaveholders had been held up before the world, in the pictorial representations so prodigally distributed by the abolitionists;—secondly, the misrepresentations to which the abolitionists had been subjected, as to their motives, designs and ultimate objects. Whilst he disapproved of any language which was not conciliatory toward those who differed from him, yet he was an anti-abolitionist, and an advocate for any measures for putting an end to every thing that would retard or interrupt our Zion.

Mr. Rozzell, of Maryland, (the mover of the resolutions,) spoke with much spirit in opposition to the reference. He had, on a former occasion, attended a Camp Meeting—some disorderly persons came to disturb the congregation. The disturbers were reasoned with, mildly and kindly—their reply was rough and insolent—"you must not hurt our feelings—not touch our characters—not wound our honor—nor assail our rights," &c., whilst these same trespassers, did not hesitate to wound the feelings, and trample on the rights, of the five hundred or thousand persons, making up the congregation. Of such a character was the conduct of the abolitionists.

He would not call in question the motives of any brother—he would not say that any abolitionist entertained a bad motive, in urging on this miserable and agitating subject—which had disturbed the whole work committed to the charge and placed under the care of the Methodists, on this continent, more than any other question that had arisen. But whilst he did this, he was not one of those who would use *butter and honey* with them. He would take a strong and decided course with the abolitionists. Nothing else would do for such people. For they had pledged themselves in the most sacred and solemn manner to prosecute their object; and they seemed by their earnestness, to think, they were doing God service. He felt satisfied, that no language in the resolutions was any too strong for them. It was due not only to the General Conference, but to the citizens of this place, and the people elsewhere, to reprobate what they had done, and what they were doing, in the strongest terms—the stronger the language employed the safer the course.

The public already knew the sentiments of this Conference—that it was strenuously opposed to abolition. A *milk and water course*, would not do. It would be almost as well to say nothing, as not to speak in the strongest language of reprobation. He would not boast of what he had done in former days—nor would he speak, now, of what had been his opinions and his efforts on the subject of slavery in by-gone times. They were known to all. His opinions had undergone no change.

Mr. Rozzell, probably had in his mind, his strenuous and uncompromising course, a short time back, against slaveholders. We have been informed, that, till lately, he was a thorn in the side of slaveholders—and in all ecclesiastical meetings, conferences, &c. among the foremost in assailing what he then seemed to consider, as the crying iniquity of the church.—Ed. PHIL.]

Whilst he entertained them, he could not but look with entire reprobation on the doings of the abolitionists, those disturbers of the whole country—who were fixing the yoke more firmly on the neck of the slave—who were injuring and distracting the churches—and destroying the souls of the slaves, by hindering the access which they had heretofore had to them, so long as they [the Methodist Ministers] had been identified, in no measure, with the abolitionists. Let this General Conference, said Mr. R. only come out on this subject—let every man in it, speak out boldly in opposition to abolition; and one hundred times more good would be done by the Methodist Church in relation to this subject, than she had ever yet done, and no church would occupy a higher place in Christendom than she.

He professed not to be unduly warm or excited by the subject under discussion. Nevertheless, the brethren who attended the abolition meeting had brought on the General Conference, severe and injurious reflection. The citizens knew all about it, and there was great excitement among them. He had been told, since the adjournment of the forenoon, that they knew the individuals who had acted so improperly, as members of the General Conference, in attending the abolition meeting. Here Mr. Rozzell threw out a strong intimation, that there might probably be some personal danger to the guilty individuals, in walking the streets—so exasperated, had he been persuaded were the citizens against it. He further said, that he knew them, and that if it was denied, he could prove who they were—he could furnish the Conference testimony, on conclusive too, of their having lectured at the abolition meeting. Their lecturing indeed was publicly talked of in the city—every body knew it. Besides this, he knew, and he could prove, that the abolitionists, belonging to the Conference had, by no means, confined themselves to lecturing publicly on this agitating subject—but they had been lecturing privately, and repeatedly bringing it up in conversation with individuals. They seemed indeed to be fearless of all consequences. They had introduced their petitions here, signed by great numbers—many of whom were women and girls. Whether even their names were properly to the petitions, he would not assume on himself to say. He had once heard of a dead man's name, being signed to an important paper—the pen having been put into his hand, and directed by the hand of a living man. But would they mention the numbers who had signed memorials and petitions in favor of abolition?—Had he tried to obtain petitions against it, there would have been not 10 or 20, but 500,000.—In conclusion, why refer the resolutions, said Mr. R! They were right in principle, and sufficiently respectful in language. He hoped, they would not be referred, but be acted on with that promptitude which the nature of the case and the state of public opinion, demanded.

Mr. Clarke, of New York, spoke in favor of the reference. He did not hesitate to say, he disapproved of what

was intended to be censured. Yet, he thought, that the resolutions, in their present form, embraced more than the circumstances of the case before them, called for. It was very desirable, that unanimity should be arrived at, as nearly as possible. The resolutions, as they stood, would not be apprehended, pass with that unanimity, which was necessary to give them their full effect. It was our wish, to satisfy the community around us—the American community—the Methodist connexion, that this Conference disapproved of abolitionism. To do this, with full effect, as near an approach as possible to unanimity was greatly to be desired.

He regarded the southern brethren very highly. We [of the north,] had been much misrepresented to them—as more averse to the south, than was true. He was happy in becoming more intimately acquainted with the brethren in slaveholding States. He had begun to find, on hearing their views more fully, that they were not so far apart as had been supposed. They had explained a great many misrepresentations of the state of things, connected with slavery, in the south. They had, to be sure, their peculiar views in relation to slavery, yet it was found, that mutual explanations had a strong tendency to bring them nearer together, as brethren. He could not but be aware of the difficulties in which the brethren of the south, were placed—he felt for them—yet, he trusted, this would interpose no obstacle to that unanimous action which was so greatly to be desired.

Mr. Payne, of Alabama—Began his remarks, by suggesting the propriety of exemption from every thing that partook of passion in the discussion of a subject, containing in itself, such strong elements of excitement. He intended to observe this temper himself—not to be unduly moved. The South, indeed, had, thus far, shown herself, calm, silent, unaggressive—and he doubted not, she would continue to be so. He was proceeding to answer an objection taken by some one, who had preceded him, (Mr. Clark, we believe,) as to the power of the General Conference, to pass a censure, such as was demanded by the resolution—saying—it had been gravely denied, that the General Conference possessed that power. He spoke with no suppressed animation, saying—and can it be possible, that such authority can be denied to the General Conference—the highest tribunal of the Church—having control over the whole Church—to censure the conduct of its own members when that became offensive—criminal? [Here Mr. P., was called to order, by Mr. Sanford, of N. York, on the ground, that such epithets, ought not to be used against brethren.]

Mr. P., spoke of the excited state of feeling, which existed in this city, against the two brethren, who had attended the abolition meeting. He had been asked for their names—he refused to give them, out of regard for their safety. The indignation at their course, was felt by the whole community. He believed, it would meet the disapprobation of all the members in the Conference. [Mr. Scott, said audibly, "NOT ALL."]

It was but the other day, brethren had said, they were aware of the condition of things at the South. But what has been doing, and to what purposes are Methodist Ministers converting their office? Are not itinerant preachers carrying about with them petitions for the abolition of slavery? Do they not employ themselves in obtaining subscribers to memorials to Conferences on the same subject—and in lecturing to abolition Societies all over the land? Where are we, sir? asked Mr. Payne. I am glad, sir, we are in the State of Ohio. But even here, in this free state, what would be the consequence, if an abolition meeting were now advertised to be held at the Court-House in this City? If such a thing were projected, even here, you would see the indignant crowd, gathering in the streets, and presenting a dark and dense mass, making its way to the appointed place, to pour out its vengeance on those, who might be rash enough to engage in such a scheme.

It would seem, sir, that nothing can cure them, [the abolitionists,]—they stop at nothing—still they persist, notwithstanding the impediments, which they are continually encountering in popular hatred and persecutions. They persevere in aggravating the slaveholder—using against him reproachful terms—injuries epithets. Not satisfied with the extent of their operations in the north, they are here, in the west, laying their train, &c.

He could not go back home, identified in any way, with this Conference, on the subject of abolition. He concluded by asking unanimity in the rejection of the amendment, and in the support of the resolutions.

Mr. Elliott, of Pittsburg—Rose to propose an amendment, declaring it to be highly imprudent, for any of the members of the General Conference, to deliver lectures on Abolition during its session. Mr. E. trusted, that the action of the General Conference, would be of such a character, that all the brethren who had joined abolition societies, would be induced to forsake them—that others who had not joined them, would be persuaded to abstain from doing so, and that Methodism, instead of abolitionism, or any thing else, would be the great object on which they would all unite. He strongly disapproved the publications of the abolitionists—their unjustly misrepresented southern brethren, and exaggerated the unhappy state of things in the slaveholding States. Methodism had greatly suffered from its influence—and so far as abolitionism was connected with Methodism, he wished to pass on it in the strongest terms that ought to be used, the disapprobation by this Conference. The zeal of Mr. E. in behalf of Methodism, so far outstripped any that had yet been displayed, that, joined to his peculiar manner, it occasioned some little merriment among the spectators, and even among the members of the Conference.

Mr. Levings of New York—opposed any substantial alterations of the resolutions. He would assent to none, except such as were merely verbal. The sentiments expressed in the resolutions met his approbation. Ever since the commencement of the Conference, the abolition brethren had sought to bring the subject of abolition into it. There had been a recklessness in their course, that seemed to spurn all customary restraints—a determination to argue this agitating subject, that set at defiance all the usual admonitions of prudence. Those of them who attended the meetings had been previously spoken to, and advised against it, by their brethren—and even the Bishops themselves had spoken to them with the same object, and had warned them of the consequences which would follow,—consequences which were now so apparent. As to the reference, he was opposed to it. It is true, a committee on slavery had been appointed. But why refer it to them? What advantage will they have in discussing this matter? Can they present it in a more tangible form? No: A course of this kind would only enable the abolitionists to press forward into still greater prominence—to further notice by this Conference—and this 'miserable' question will derive from it a large additional amount of importance. The language of the resolutions was not at all too strong for the circumstances and the occasion to which it was to be applied. The Conference had an undoubted right to take notice of the official conduct of its members whilst in session. Having this right, it was clearly his opinion it ought to be exercised on the present occasion, for putting an end to this matter.

Mr. Youns, of Ohio—was opposed to the amendment. He was in ordinary cases, opposed to harsh language—but the present, he conceived, was a case which, so far from calling for mild and gentle words, ought to be marked with asperity. As to the publications of the aboli-

tionists and their lecturers on abolition,—he had never read any of the first, and had had nothing to do with the last. They were 'implements and utensils' that he did not wish to have about him—he had no desire to handle them, or to touch them in any way. In no fashion had he, or did he desire, any knowledge of them. A great deal had been said about Roman Catholicism, but he thought that there was no comparison. The Roman Catholics believed all that was deemed essential to salvation. The objection to them was, they believed a little too much, a little more than was necessary. He thought there was no analogy between Catholicism and modern Abolitionism. The latter was at war with all sense of decency, it outraged all our notions of good order and propriety, and was, in its every feature, utterly intolerable. He was opposed to any amendment. Instead of laying the public excitement now existing, and blown up by the unjustifiable conduct of those who had gone to the abolition meeting, it would only tend to raise it still higher. If we should adopt this amendment, we would become responsible for the protection of their persons from public outrage. Let us then, by passing the resolutions lay the public excitement, so that every brother may pass the street in safety. 2.

[We scarcely know how it is that such a phantom should take possession of the minds of the several intelligent men who seem to have entertained it—in view of the fact, that there is in this city an Anti-Slavery Society of nearly one hundred members—that they hold their meeting without molestation—that they use no concealment as to their abolitionism—that they pursue their business as other citizens without being disturbed—and that an anti-slavery newspaper has, for several weeks, been in operation in Cincinnati, and no attempt has been made to interfere with it. The abolitionists in the General Conference, who attended our meeting a few evenings since, are we believe, as secure in their persons, whilst passing the street, as is Mr. Young, or any other, equally decided advocate of Slavery in the church, or out of the church.—Ed. PHIL.]

Mr. Crowder, of Virginia—spoke in opposition to the amendment. He contended if we rightly remember the drift of his remarks, that the Conference had full jurisdiction over the conduct of its members, whilst attending it in discharge of official duties. The main subject—slavery in the South—was one in which the north had no interest, and of course no right to interfere with in any way. The course of the abolitionists, too, was doing great injury to the slave, in drawing closer the bonds of slavery, and rendering his case more and more hopeless. It also, prevented the spread of the Gospel, by shutting up the access heretofore enjoyed by the Methodist Ministers to the slaves. The masters, now, jealous of the preachers generally, excluded from their slaves, Methodist preachers, as well as others. Believing it altogether important to the most beneficial disposition of the whole question that the resolutions should pass in their present form, he deplored every thing that went to defeat that object, by sustaining the amendment.

Several other gentlemen made brief remarks before the question on the amendments were taken. Among them, Mr. Storrs and Mr. Norris, the two members who were referred to, though not named in the first resolution. They said, that the persons who attended and spoke, at the Cincinnati Anti-Slavery Society, had, at that time no official duty to perform—they had not been appointed to preach, nor were they called to do any business in committee. Besides, it was a regular meeting of that Society. They had delivered no formal lecture. Notwithstanding, had the sentiments of the general Conference, in relation to their attending the meeting, been as well known by them before they had pledged themselves to be present, as it was now, they would have taken a different course.

After a few remarks from the mover, Mr. Rozzell, the vote was taken, and the amendment lost.

Mr. Rozzell again made some spirited remarks in favor of the resolutions, and urged on the Conference their immediate adoption. He appeared a little testy at the delay occasioned by discussion.

Mr. Scott, of Massachusetts, obtained the floor, and commenced a calm and dispassionate examination of the resolutions. He began by asking the patience of members, as he would probably do the principal part of the speaking on behalf of the abolitionists who were in the Conference. We will not now give the speech of Mr. Scott—trusting we shall be enabled to publish, before long, a sketch of it from his own notes. It was a noble and lofty effort; calm, dignified, generous, christian. He showed no wastiness, nor petulance against those who differed with him, and who had been so prodigal in their reprobation of abolitionists. He was several times interrupted by his impatient adversaries—yet his calmness and self-possession were in no measure disturbed, even for a moment. The dignity of the experienced debater—understanding his subject in all its aspects—calmly taking up the admissions of his opponents and routing them with the very weapons their own unacquaintance with the subject and their intemperate passion had so abundantly supplied; directing them all, with consummate skill—yet with the kindness and forbearance of the christian; in all these essentials of religious discussion, Mr. Scott presented himself in striking and honorable contrast with nearly all, if not all, who supported the resolutions. He had proceeded about an hour in his speech, when the Conference adjourned.

Friday morning—Bishop Soule, previous to the renewal of the discussion, said, that, in his opinion, the best service the conference could render to the church of Christ, their own church, and to the country, would be to abstain from all interference with the principles of the constitution, with relations between the states and between them and the general government, and the political relation of master and slave. He did not wish, however, to trammel the deliberations of the general Conference, only he did hope they would discuss the subject with calmness.

Mr. Bangs rose to a point of order.—Slavery was not the question before the conference; it was the conduct of the brethren who were reported to have delivered abolition lectures. The chair decided that Mr. Scott, was in order; and he then continued the argument for the space of about two hours.

Mr. Crowder, rose to reply to the last speaker. He laid down the proposition, that there were difficulties which forbade the occupying of the ground taken by Mr. Scott. (This was that Slavery was morally and always wrong.) The difficulties were, first, of a Scriptural sort, and here the speaker took occasion to observe that slaveholders had evidently been unchristianized by the brother who last spoken; for slave-holding was a sin, of course slaveholders were criminal. Mr. Crowder failed to notice the distinction between motive and action, the morality of a system and the morality of men. He referred to Leviticus, 25th chapter, where we learn that the Jews were permitted to buy servants of the heathen round about and hold them as such forever. Abraham, too, the Father of the Faithful, bought and held slaves, and the Centurion who besought Jesus that his servant might be healed, was also a slaveholder; and yet, Jesus, so far from rebuking him for this conduct, said he had not found so great a faith—no—not in Israel.

The Apostles at the beginning of their mission found slavery, of a far worse character than Southern slavery existing in the Roman Empire, and yet in no case did they intermeddle with it. If thou mayst, use thy liberty

rather; but let every man abide in the calling in which he is called. And there too was the case of Onesimus, he was a slave; still St. Paul acknowledged the right of his master and sent him back. No other example than that of our Lord and his Apostles is obligatory on us. He was an experimental man—would not contend with abstractions, abstractions were mere nonentities.

There were difficulties arising out of the history of slavery and the movements in relation to it. In the days of Wesley there was no crusade against slavery. Watson was some time hesitating before he would connect himself with an abolition society. Great Britain and the United States, held different relations to slavery. A wide Ocean separated the former from her colonies; here we are all together. Besides no compensation is proposed to slaveholders by abolitionists.

The abolition movements moreover were directly opposed to the interests of that most noble society—the Colonization society.

When a Dutch vessel first disgorged a cargo of slaves in Virginia, that state protested against it; but England imposed slavery on the colony, and men of the New England states, especially citizens of Providence, were engaged in this slave-trade.

There were difficulties of a political character. By the compact of Union, Slavery was put beyond the control of the North. At a celebrated meeting in Boston, Mr. Otis had publicly contended, that inasmuch as slavery was known to exist at the time the states became one confederacy, and as the northern states nevertheless formed a Union with the South, the agitation of the question now, was in fact a breach of the contract they solemnly made. The question was emphatically a political one: religion forbids ministers of the gospel to intermeddle with political rights or privileges. Their work was to save souls. They must be subject to the powers that be, but how could this be the case, so long as they would intermeddle with such questions. The question cannot be made any other than a political question. These societies assailed directly our compact of union—principles and relations established by most solemn engagements and oaths.

We were sometimes accused of cruelty—of hugging the evil to our bosoms. Slavery was amongst ourselves, it should be handled by ourselves. He was born in its midst—his father was a slaveholder. He would not have slaves, when his father offered them to him: he preferred money. He married a lady whose father owned slaves. The father deceased, and he fell heir to a number of slaves. He wished to be cleared from them: proposed they should go to Liberia; only one consented. He then told them, he could not keep them; they must get other masters or go out of the state. They got other masters. He had preached to slaves—met with them in class. Slaves were rarely treated with cruelty: they loved their masters, they were bound up in their masters, and their masters in them. He ought, however, not to omit mentioning one circumstance connected with his own case. When he was about selling his slaves, his wife desired to retain two of them; to this he had consented, and these two he owned yet. They had wept on his departure for the General Conference. He was in the habit of calling them to the fire-side and explaining to them the word of God. He meant no insult to his northern brethren—but his cook dressed as well as any of the wives of those brethren. They were not deprived of privileges; although kidnapped—stolen from their own country, thousands of them have been converted by the religion of Jesus Christ. Thus has God brought good out of evil.

Abolitionism goes to break up missionary operations in behalf of the slaves; and wherever cruelty exists, it aggravates and confirms it.

Slavery had no tendency to produce amalgamation. In proportion to the number of people, there were as many, if not more, mulattoes in the north than in the south.

The Gospel forbade adultery, fornication &c., in express terms, but not slavery. [Nor gambling, nor theatres].—En.

Modern abolitionism tended to destroy the fairest prospects of the republic—and blast the hopes of surrounding nations, who are looking to us eagerly for the solution of the problem, whether man is capable of self-government. Let this crusade against the compact of our union go on, and the union is severed—the church is severed. Then will the chances of political aspirants be increased; and despotism will be the result. Civil and religious liberty will be destroyed, and the hopes of nations will perish. Modern abolitionism tended to such results. Look at the epithets used—murderers, robbers, thieves; the whole vocabulary had been ransacked for opprobrious epithets. He therefore would vote for the resolution, disapproving the course of these brethren. He would also with his whole heart, unqualifiedly give his voice for the passage of the second one, denouncing abolitionism.

Mr. Winans said, that he did not intend to confine his remarks to the first resolution—he would reply directly to brother Scott's argument. He would preface what he had to say by a few remarks, which might appear egotistical. He was from the extreme south. He arose with perfect calmness, without agitation, without a single angry feeling towards any brother. But occupying the situation he did, feeling his responsibility to his God, to the church, and to the interests of humanity, he could not be without strong emotion.

He would meet the brother on the fundamental ground of his argument—he would examine his strong moral views of slavery. It had been assumed, that slavery was wrong in some circumstances, in no circumstances or in all circumstances. Now he designed to prove from the brother's own admission, that slavery was right in all circumstances. Jehovah had permitted—had regulated slavery: would he permit—would he regulate that which was morally wrong? Could there be a blinding influence, strong enough to induce any one to charge God with sanctioning crime? It would be needless to refer to particular scriptures; but many passages did exist which established beyond controversy that God did permit perpetual—hereditary slavery. This admitted, it was plain, that circumstances might deprive slavery of an immoral character. He would have opposed slavery in its origin. It was as clear as the morning sun that slavery in the abstract is wrong. But is it wrong now in the Southern States? This is the point in dispute between abolitionists and anti-abolitionists. Have we not seen, that circumstances justified it in the case of the Hebrews? If circumstances can justify it, he thought they existed in the South. Another question would arise—ought Christians to endeavor to change these circumstances. He had no doubt, they ought—that it was obligatory on them to do so. But was the course of abolitionists right? clearly not. It was most unpropitious, most injudicious—and calculated to effect precisely what was most opposite to their purposes.

[This paragraph of Mr. Winan's speech is by no means a meagre presentation of the argument as he would call it, by which he attempted to answer one of the most simple and comprehensive demonstrations that we have ever heard, proving that slavery is right in no circumstances. Mr. W. we have no reason to doubt, thought it very triumphant—without seeming once to suspect, that he had fallen into the blunder so common with unskillful reasoners, and passionate declaimers, of "begging the question"—taking for granted the thing to be proved—the very matter in dispute. Now Mr. Scott might deny altogether, that

slavery—property in man, with its concomitants—ever existed among the Hebrews, with the approbation of God. So far from this, Mr. S. could easily demonstrate from the history of that people, that even a remote approximation on their part to oppression, in the form of slave-holding, was followed by the severest, national punishments. Again,—if according to Mr. Winan's ethics, the peculiar circumstances the South justify or excuse slavery there, why—on every principle of sound reasoning, provided slavery be a convenient and profitable institution—ought these justifying or exonerating circumstances to be altered? or why, is there an obligation, resting on Christians to do away with circumstances that excuse or justify a course of action they are pursuing? To a mind capable of comprehending the plainest process of reasoning, it would seem wantonly wicked, to remove or alter circumstances which alone are relied on, to excuse and justify, whilst the subject, or course of action around which they exist, acknowledged to be in itself, incapable of justification or excuse, is left untouched and unaltered. The more the justifying circumstances are removed from the unjustifiable subject, the deeper, it appears to us, must be the guilt of those engaged in the one, whilst they continue in the other.

We have never yet heard an argument from the advocates of southern oppression, on what is now beginning to be called the Bible view of the question, which did not satisfy us, either that their scriptural investigations had been culpably superficial—or that the practice or the advocacy of oppression superinduced over their minds, an influence as blinding, to the truth in their case, as that created by Jewish prejudice against the lowly character of our Saviour, and which led them to reject him as the Messiah, and crucify him as a malefactor. Yet do they rush into the argument, as a horse into battle, and generally meet with the overthrow to which their nakedness and thoughtless slavery expose them.

If there be on the side of oppression, any position which is impregnable, we do not believe, it has yet been occupied by its champions. Beside this, their armor is fragile—the blow of a pigmy shivers it. The Babylonish garment—the wedge of gold is hidden in their tent. Let them expect nothing but discomfiture, till they can attack with the animation of men who have prayed much, have studied the word of God much, and have resolved to do the will of God however diverse it may be from their preconceived notions. Even this preparation, perfect as it may seem, by no means excludes the knowledge to be derived by a few hours attention to the elementary rules of Watt's or Whately's Logic.—Ed. Phil.]

He was not born in a slave state,—he was a Pennsylvanian by birth. He had been brought up to believe a slaveholder as great a villain as a horse-thief; but he had gone to the South &c., there long residence had changed his views; he had become a slaveholder—a slaveholder on principle. There was suspicion abroad in the south. To obviate such suspicion and gain free access to the slave, so as to do him good, it was highly advantageous for a minister that he himself should hold slaves; and he could see no impropriety, but advantage in members, preachers, presiding elders and even Bishops, being slaveholders. Yes said Mr. W. however novel the sentiment may be, however startling it may be to many, I avow this opinion boldly, and without any desire to conceal it.

The Brother admitted that Congress had no power of legislation on slavery in the states. The only influence, therefore abolitionism could exert, was moral in its character—must be exerted over mind. Now the legislatures of the slave states only, could abolish slavery; therefore this moral influence must be exerted on them—he affirmed that abolition in its influence on those bodies, was directly opposite to that which its friends designed. For the ten years, preceding the last three years, there was a constantly increasing disposition to meliorate the condition of the slave. The abolition excitement was got up. In one moment, a paralysis was felt in every nerve of the south—in all those influences, looking to the emancipation of the slave. Though a slaveholder himself, no abolitionist felt more sympathy for the slave than he did—none had rejoiced more in the hope of a coming period, when the print of a slave's foot would not be seen on the soil. His heart sank within him when he contemplated the incendiary influences of abolition. They were incendiary, for they had kindled a flame upon the dearest hopes of the African.

He and his brethren in the south were to act on this question—not others for them. Abolition was considered a murderous scheme at the south—here the speaker became so rapid and vehement, that we found it impossible to note accurately what he said. We remember, however, that his fruitful imagination pictured, "murdered wives," "massacred children," "burning towns," "cities and habitations rendered desolate," "slaves freed to be impoverished, to starve, to die,"—consequences which it was believed would result from the success of abolition doctrines. Southern legislatures, he said, would never listen to such doctrines—they were deaf, they would be deaf as an adder. The south already looked upon the people of the north as their enemies—thirsting for their blood. A few knew that the body of the north, was opposed to such schemes—regarded them as fanatical. And the most favorable view he could take of abolitionists was, that they were carried away by fanaticism.

The Brother had said that abolitionism had an intimate connexion with our missionary operations. It had; but in a very different sense from what the Brother meant. He would state a case to illustrate his views. A Brother was sent last year to a circuit on the Mississippi coast, comprising three parishes. No sooner were the abolition movements known at the north, than public meetings were called in two of the parishes, and it was decided in them that Methodist preachers should preach no more: because two Conferences in the north had avowed themselves in favor of abolition. The third parish was not so hasty—had a little more common sense. A public meeting was called in this, but owing to the influence of one man, no such prohibitory measure was adopted. This man pledged his honor, his property—his life in defence of the purity of the preacher's character and motives, and he was allowed to preach amongst them. In the two parishes where so violent measures were taken, the most of the residents were slaves—and preachers had never before been questioned. Let abolitionists proceed, and they would effect nothing better in the South. In the north they might raise a flame, and call it a holy flame, but in the south it would be the fire of hell.

Methodists had two sets of fathers—one set, abolitionists. Bishop Asbury's name had been introduced—Bishop Asbury, before his death, was decidedly an anti-abolitionist. Bishop Asbury, at first was a believer in the doctrines of abolition and he acted on the belief. Experience convinced him of his error; and his course was changed. It would be amusing, were not the subject so important, to hear brethren talk of the great additional light of modern times. They had said it was too late in the day to put back this question. They supposed a flood of light had been poured on this subject. The modesty of brethren was great. The fathers of Methodism were thrown into the shade by the increased light of this day. The speaker declared emphatically;—From the North or Great Britain, we will not receive, we do not want, aid or advice to help us to rid ourselves of slavery. We will sit in judgment on our own case, we will follow our own course. He would not censure the north for its high assumptions. Neither Great Britain nor the North, however, occupied positions from which they could help the south. The greatest service they could do it, was to let it alone. The question was a political question with which none but the South had any thing to do.

In the sight of Heaven this was their only proper course. It was important to the interests of slaves and in view of the question of slavery, that there be Christians, who were slaveholders. Christian ministers should be slaveholders and diffused throughout the south. Yes sir, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, should be slaveholders—yes, he repeated it boldly, there should be members, and Deacons and Elders, and Bishops too, who were slaveholders. For if slaveholding were a valid reason for excluding a man from office, it was a valid reason for excluding him from membership. The south should be heard—should lose nothing from him. Hear it or not—that was not his concern, it was the concern of the conference.

He did not wish to be misunderstood in relation to the first resolution. There was great indecency, great indecorum, great disrespect to the conference, to the city, to public opinion—in the conduct of the brethren, proposed to be censured. He had no doubt as to the propriety of censure. They merited reprehension. Abolition movements should be reprehended; for they were evil and only evil, always and every where. It had been insinuated that he wanted milk and water resolutions. This was, as to himself, a novel accusation. He had commonly been charged with too much boldness—too much severity, but never before accused in this fashion. He knew not how much animal courage he might possess—but to moral and political courage he avowed his claim. Indeed a distinguished politician of the south said of him, that he would make an excellent politician, only he had too much candor. His character must indeed be essentially changed, if he could keep back the truth, to conciliate the good opinion of any.

Mr. Sandford thought it due to the delegation with which he was connected, that should be heard.

They occupied a middle ground, as they thought, between two extremes. They were no abolitionists, but held their peculiar sentiments. On the abstract question of slavery, their opinions were no other than such as are expressed in their Discipline: they were Methodists in this particular. They regretted the existence of slavery; but it was beyond their power—they could not prevent its existence. He regretted the measures of abolition, as being, in their tendency, injurious. He was a warm and decided colonizationist. That institution had been productive of much good—numerous slaves had been emancipated by it, but its operations had been retarded by abolition movements. These movements had done much evil and very little good; and had prevented the accomplishment of the good that might have been wrought, in view of the interests of the slaves. The people of the north deplored abolition movements. They abhorred slavery, but believed it morally wrong to agitate the question in the north to the injury of the south. It would only rivet the chains upon the slave. So strong was public feeling against abolition, that in a certain place, the people, suspecting a preacher of holding abolition sentiments, declared they would not hear him preach. The speaker said a few other things, by way of disclaiming all connexion with abolitionists; for which he received little, or no credit from Mr. Smith, who here interrupted him, on a point of order, and said, if we remember right, that the brother seemed to be one of that class of men who neither did harm nor good.

Mr. Rozzel said, had he known beforehand, that so much extraneous matter would have been introduced into the discussion, he would not have offered the resolutions to the Conference. It would be idle, he thought, to attempt to answer the arguments of the brother. [Scott] If the resolutions had had the confluent small-pox, these arguments had not come near enough to catch the infection. He then read the resolutions. He said, that untrammelled by this unhappy excitement, many of them, before abolitionists were born, were engaged in meliorating the condition of the slave population. Whenever the consequences of any measures for the removal of an evil were worse than the evil itself, the prosecutors of such measures stood charged before God as criminals. Abolitionists reminded him of Herod—when Herod had promised the damsel with an oath to give her whatever she might ask, and she had asked for the head of John the Baptist, the king, rather than break his promise would commit murder. Abolitionists had prevented them from acting. They knew nothing about them. In the south, they had been successfully engaged in freeing slaves, but abolitionists had shut up the way. Houses of worship had been burnt; religious privileges taken away, and the houses of their colored people mutilated in Baltimore. Never had one individual been benefitted by abolition.

Dr. Capers, of South Carolina, rose to state some facts, with which he was personally acquainted. Methodism had been introduced into South Carolina, under very favorable circumstances. The doctrine of the forgiveness of sins, by repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, unless the Baptists formed an exception, was not, at that time, preached in South Carolina. The community was in an unprejudiced state. They soon formed a society in Charleston, composed of as respectable and worthy people, as ever entered into the composition of any church. The church, to be sure, labored under some disadvantages; but under none as connected with slavery. He would narrate a little anecdote. A preacher stopped on Cooper's river, at the house of Mr. Ball, one of the foremost planters in the state. When evening came, and the period of work was over, the preacher proposed, that the negroes should be assembled, in order that he might speak to them on the subject of religion. The proposal was immediately responded to, and information forthwith sent off to the neighboring plantations; so that a congregation of from one to two thousand was speedily assembled. Mr. Ball was so well pleased, that he desired to retain the preacher as his chaplain, and that he might preach to his negroes. This, the speaker intimated, was then the state of things. They had free access to the plantations. As much was done, as could be done. Dr. Coke, about this time made his first visit, but passed hastily through the country. On his second visit, a different aspect was exhibited. The south had then but little participation in the affairs of the church. It came to pass that in 1806, the general Conference, composed, three fourths, of northern brethren, was induced to take those measures, to which the brother from the New England Conference referred in his speech. Those measures were reprobatory of slavery and slaveholding, and were accompanied by an exhortation, to get up memorials on the subject of slavery to the legislatures. George Dorrel, representative from the South Carolina Conference, protested against these measures. The matter leaked out—the jealousies of the people were awakened—Methodist preachers became objects of suspicion, and were in fact considered dangerous to the public peace. The largest planters, and of course the mass of slaves, dwelt in the low rich counties. From these, Methodist preachers were excluded, and driven back into the interior. What was the result? In Charleston, one of the purest and most noble of its ministers, George Dorrel was dragged, like a felon, to the pump, and only rescued at the point of the sword. Methodist preachers could not save themselves—they were put down. There were not many noble then, not many rich, not many high; they were reduced to the most pitiable condition. A reaction ensued—they be-

gan to be pitied—persecution ceased. Their meeting-houses began to be crowded. The black people, without them deprived of gospel privileges, began to enjoy them again. The galleries of the churches were filled with them. Again and again, were the brethren interfered with, and repeatedly taken from the pulpit, because of the number of blacks present. In 1811 they had little or no access to the blacks. An instance would illustrate. Brother Donnelly, wishing to preach to the colored people in a certain place, and baptize some among them, had to set out at midnight upon his benevolent enterprise. Another instance;—about 12 miles from Charleston was another place, where it was desirable to preach to the colored people. They had never before heard Jesus Christ preached. But one house in the neighborhood could be occupied for this purpose, and that was a grog shop. It was resolved, however, to preach there. By some means it came to the ears of the neighboring slaveholders. They determined to prevent it. A mob was to be raised in a grand style; the negroes were to be punished, and the preacher ducked in a duck-pond hard by. The time came and it fell to his lot to go—but there was no disturbance. That very spot was the place of his nativity—he was well known there; and also it was understood that his connexions were of such a character as to secure him, to a certain extent, against any personal violence. But that preaching place was abandoned, for Methodist preachers were under the ban. At length, people began to consider that many of them were slaveholders—why should they be insurrectionists? This single circumstance went far to raise them above suspicion.

Dr. Capers narrated some other circumstances, but our notes are here deficient. These, together with the facts he had adduced, he brought forward to shew, how delicate was the question of slavery; in what peculiar, perplexing circumstances it placed the southern brethren; how much injury had been done to them, as well as to the slaves, by northern interference, and how much more injury would inevitably result in the same way, from the efforts of abolitionists. He called upon his abolition brethren to beware—to pause before they proceeded farther in their misguided efforts. Whilst he was narrating what difficulties the Methodist ministers had labored under—what they had endured, both of privation and persecution for the slave—the affection and gratitude of the slaves, &c. &c., many tears were shed by the slaveholding members of the Conference. Their emotion was great, while the Doctor a slaveholder himself as we are informed, was spreading before them the picture of their many afflictions, and their eyes were imploringly directed at times towards the place where their abolition brethren sat.

The amount of all we could gather was—that ministers of the gospel, in the south, if they did their duty faithfully, were liable to persecution.

After Dr. Capers had concluded, the Conference had a recess till 3 o'clock, P. M.

May, 13. Afternoon Session.—There was much small talk. We have notes of only one member's speech. We think this was delivered, on the offering of an amendment by Mr. Scott. The debate had been generally gotten through with, and it seemed to be understood, that the resolutions would pass. The question was about to be taken when Mr. Scott moved to amend the second resolution, by inserting immediately after the words, 'Abolitionism in whole and in part,' the following—'and that we also disapprove of slavery.' This gave rise to some remarks, when a member suggested that it would be better to amend, by inserting the words of the discipline in reference to slavery, which are 'that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery.' Mr. Scott immediately agreed to adopt this, and offered it in the place of his original amendment. An animated discussion now arose on the adoption of this amendment. The majority were doubtless a good deal embarrassed. One in his simplicity said,—he did not conceive how any brother could object to incorporating into the resolution, a sentiment which they had already avowed, as a church. But he evidently mistook the mark. There was great objection. Southern members soon placed the matter in its true light. The incorporation of this sentiment in the resolutions, would neutralize entirely the original design and tendency of them. If the amendment were adopted, the resolutions could not be sent to the south. The amendment would be construed as designed to cloak the real opinions of the Conference. That body would most certainly be charged with abolitionism. Mr. Winans, of Mississippi, begged leave to state a fact, which would show how unpopular, under present circumstances, would be any such amendment. The particulars, we are unable to recollect, but this was the amount. An excitement had been occasioned in New Orleans against Methodists. The Mayor of the city had been informed by some interested person, of the article in the discipline, in relation to slavery. From this it was inferred, that the Methodists were genuine abolitionists. The excitement was not allayed, until a clergyman of another persuasion, took a discipline, went to the mayor, showed him the article, and explained to him, that it had been inserted in the early period of the church, that it was not a new thing. We are at a loss to give the precise words of Mr. Winans; but the impression made on us was, that the article, in relation to slavery was introduced, when the circumstances of the church were different from what they are now—that now the article is in fact a dead letter.

The members from the free states, when they saw the stand taken by their southern brethren on the subject, were generally in favor of rejecting the amendment,—not, they asserted, because they did not adhere to the sentiments of their discipline; but the object was now, to allay the excitement of abolition, and satisfy the public mind of their opposition to it. With regard to slavery, their opinion was already expressed, and stood out in their discipline to the notice of the world. Mr. Scott thought, that, if it were necessary, on the one hand to guard against abolition, it was no less necessary on the other to guard against slavery. He thought this was indeed an alarming period,—when Methodist ministers shrunk from openly declaring, what they avowed in the discipline, as their creed. He did hope that brethren would not reject the amendment, and thus virtually abrogate a part of their own Discipline. He made many other, forcible and eloquent remarks, in the midst of which he was called to order by Mr. Holmes of the Pittsburg Conference, who supposed, that the speaker had violated one of the rules of order, in speaking twice on the same subject. Mr. Scott was pronounced by the chair in order, because, before, he had spoken to the original resolution; now, he was speaking to the amendment. Mr. Holmes manifested a disposition to persist, which, however, not being encouraged, he sat down. Not long after Mr. Scott had concluded, Mr.

Smith of Va.—began by professing to be a man, a Christian, a gentleman. As a man, he had feelings which had been whipped and goaded on every side during this debate; as a Christian, he disavowed, before God and the Conference, harboring any unkind sentiments towards his abolition brethren. He could not entertain harsh feelings towards any man. Reflections had passed through his mind, while, considering the unfortunate situation in which those brethren had placed themselves, which brought tears to his eyes.

He was sorry for the course his southern brethren had taken in relation to these resolutions. The abstract question of slavery, they ought not to have discussed. Indulgence in such discussions was lowering their dignity—prostrating them, before the American nation. Slavery was to be looked at, not in the abstract but the concrete—as it was in fact. Abolition was fraught with the most mischievous consequences. He here read an extract from, we presume, an abolition paper—to this amount, that any American citizen who holds another as a slave, is guilty of a crime irreconcilable with the spirit of Christianity. He remarked that the inference from this was, that the slaveholder was no Christian—could be no Christian. 'Must such men,' said he, 'whip in hand, booted and spurred, ride over our feelings? As we live—as God lives—it becomes brethren to pause. Modern abolitionism proclaimed her own consummate folly, when, in the same breath, on the very heels, of the declaration, that slaveholders are criminals against God and man—guilty of the most God-provoking crimes, she turns round and tells them that she does not unchristianize them.

Here Mr. Scott rose and asked explicitly whether the speaker had any allusion to him—for if so, he was misrepresenting him. Mr. Smith turned towards him, and exclaimed, 'I have no more to do with that brother, than if he did not exist;' and with great heat he added, 'I wish to God, he were in Heaven.' He added something in an under tone about wishing all abolitionists there, and himself, if ever he should become one. Some remarks were here made by the chair; when Mr. Smith said he had so often been called by these men a man stealer, &c., that by this time he was perfectly used to them. That brother (alluding to Mr. Scott) was perfectly sincere, but he knew nothing more about abolitionism than he did about slavery.

He then read another extract from the same paper giving as he said, another feature of abolitionism. The amount of it was, that slavery should be renounced now and forever. The objection to it, was, that it was impracticable. The attempt to do such an act, would array against them all the feeling of the south. If success chanced to attend the measures of abolition, all those consequences would inevitably follow, which had been depicted by the brother, who had spoken in the morning.

Modern abolitionism was to be seen in what it did, rather than in what it professed. In its effects, it was inflammatory in the north, and incendiary in the south. Its withering influence had been felt in the church—in the quarterly meeting—in the class room. The blight of heaven had followed, wherever it prevailed. Brethren from the north would testify to this fact; if they would not, he would upon oath. He knew the societies—the associations in which this effect was manifest.

Modern abolitionism was a great political and religious heresy. Its design was to array all the moral and religious feeling of the people against the political institutions of the land; and it was in direct contravention of the book he held in his hand, [the New Testament.] The apostle Paul, when he went forth to preach the Gospel, found slavery existing in the world and recognized it. He relied on preaching Christ crucified, as the great means for remedying every evil. He formed no abolition societies. He [Mr. Smith.] and his brethren of the south, expected, by preaching Christ, to accomplish all that could be accomplished. These abolition brethren are for interfering with the political institutions of the land. They had engaged in a crusade—harangues, petitions, memorials, addressing political assemblies—nothing was left untried. In all these respects, they had departed from the example of the apostles. The Discipline of the Church, moreover, authorized no interference with the political institutions of the country.

They, of the south, entreated of their brethren of the north, just to let them alone. If they would not hear to this, why then they must part. Either abolitionists would have to separate from them, or they from abolitionists. Such inevitably would be the result, unless the brethren should change their course.

After a little more discussion, the question, was called for, and on the votes being counted, it was found, that 123 voted against the amendment—against incorporating in the resolution, that "they were as much as ever, convinced of the great evil of slavery." The members of the New England and New Hampshire Delegations, fourteen in number, voted for it.

The vote was then taken on the resolutions themselves—they were both carried by large majorities. A resolution was also introduced to have them published in the city journals generally. This, we understand was afterwards reconsidered and recalled—the publishing order being limited to the Western Christian Advocate.

SEQUEL.—Saturday morning.—We have been told, for we were not present, that on the meeting of the Conference, Mr. Crowder remarked, that it had been thought by some, that his remarks on the preceding day, asserting that his cook, one of his slaves, dressed as well as the wives of the northern brethren were offensive. He intended by it nothing offensive to those brethren, for he was willing to include his own wife with theirs. Indeed he and Mrs. Crowder when they determined to retain those two slaves mentioned by him before, had resolved that they the slaves should dress as well as they (Mr. and Mrs. C.) did. He repeated that nothing injurious to the feelings of others was intended. However, said he, if it is the desire of the Conference, I will take back all my remarks.

We could easily prove even by the testimony of our adversaries, that the anti-slavery societies in this country are engaged in the same war, on the same principles, with the same weapons, against the same sort of enemies, as Clarkson, Wilberforce, and others carried on with such glorious success.

POETRY.

The lady, to whom our readers are indebted for the following lines, expresses some apprehension, in a letter accompanying them, that they may be considered as unworthy of a place in the *Philanthropist*. We hazard nothing, when we say, that the public taste will soon put to flight her own misgivings—and demand from her gifted mind other labors on which to bestow its admiration and its sympathy.

[For the *Philanthropist*.]

A little slave had died. He was dressed for the grave, when his mother who was also a slave upon the same plantation, came to look for the last time upon her son.

While gazing at the corpse, she was heard to render thanks to God that her child was dead, and thus released from the horrors of slavery; for, said she, "there are no slaves in heaven."

In stoic mood, that stricken mother stands,
Erect her form, and clasped her wearied hands,
No inward grief bursts forth in rising sigh,
No tear betrays her heart's deep agony;
But calm that brow, and calmer still that breast,
Like Judah's sea, by Jesus hushed to rest.
Perchance a secret hope still lingers there,
For, see, those lips are moved in fervent prayer,
And will the Saviour come, as oft of old,
To raise that stiff and cold so deadly cold?
But list!—I thank thee that my child is dead,
That in the grave he'll lay his aching head;
The fettered slave hath found a sweet release,
And now, with freedom blest, with God at peace,
No tyrant's frown—no proud oppressor's rod,
Is found within the "dwelling place of God."

RELLA.

Putnam, May 3, 1836.

'Anti-Slavery Memorial.

[The following memorial was presented by Mr. Adams, of the New Hampshire Delegation, on Tuesday morning last. It was not read, but committed to the committee on slavery. Some five or six others of the same character, were presented by delegates from several of the Northern Conferences. They were all disposed of in the same manner.]

MEMORIAL

Of the New Hampshire Annual Conference, to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, holden in Cincinnati, on the subject of Slavery.

The New Hampshire Annual Conference, beg leave, through a committee, to memorialize the Bishops and Members of the General Conference, on the importance of removing from the Methodist Episcopal Church, as effectually, as speedily, and peaceably as possible, the great evil of slavery.

We consider slavery as it exists in the United States, one of the most solemn and momentous subjects, which could possibly engage the attention of your venerable body; whether we view it particularly in relation to the numbers who are enslaved, the evils which they are doomed to endure, or the character and profession of those by whom they are enslaved, and the guilt we are compelled to believe their conduct incurs in the sight of the infinite God; or the dreadful consequences to which this system is constantly exposing the states where it prevails, as well, indeed, as the peace and prosperity of this whole nation.

The fact, that there are now more than two millions of men, women, and children, in this Christian land, deprived of those rights which the great charter of our political existence solemnly declares are natural to all men, and inalienable, should strike every lover of mankind and of his country, and all who fear the God of justice with alarm! And can we calmly reflect upon the fearful ratio with which this class of human beings are increased among us, and feel no concern for the prosperity of the church, and the fate of the country? Can we remember, that, nearly two hundred are enslaved, and added to their number, every day, and feel no concern as to the final results of this growing system among us?

We believe that the great evil of slavery has, in some cases, many mitigating circumstances, which go to meliorate the suffering condition of the slave. And such are our feelings of charity towards the ministers and members of our church, that we believe, so far as slavery exists among us, it is generally in its mildest form, and that much humanity, and many worldly comforts, and many religious privileges are bestowed upon them. We also view, with great satisfaction, the labors and sacrifices of our missionaries among the slave population, and doubt not, but they have greatly contributed to the comfort and salvation of the poor slave. We are also aware of the very iniquitous and oppressive laws of many of the slave states, which go exceedingly to embarrass the prospect of emancipation. But we are still of opinion, that as a church, we are greatly polluted with this sin, and that we can never exert a consistent and successful influence against slavery, until we use all possible means to purge from among us this great evil.

This is a time when the attention of the whole Christian community should be aroused and directed to this subject. God himself commands his people especially, to "Remember them that are in bonds as bound with them;" and it is He who has said, "Open thy mouth and plead the cause of the poor and needy;" nor can your memorialists believe, that either they themselves, or their brethren generally, have been as faithful as they ought to have been, in the performance of the duties enjoined in these, and numberless other similar passages of Scripture. But it does seem to your memorialists, that there are reasons the most conclusive, why we should not neglect these solemn duties.

It is well known, that the subject of slavery is now engrossing the attention of a great proportion of the people of this country, and Christians of all countries; and that it is undergoing a thorough investigation by many in all ranks and classes of society. It is utterly vain to think of stopping discussion upon this subject. It is one of exciting interest, as we are often told, your memorialists conceive this fact to be one conclusive reason, why all who wish the prosperity of the Christian church, and this nation should avoid everything which would look even like an attempt to prohibit or to stop it. We might as well attempt to dry up the sources of the mighty river, by simply throwing a bed of earth across the main channel in which it flows. That impediment might, indeed, hinder the course of a part of the stream for a little while, but it would not dry up the various fountains whence it originates, and such an attempt would afford it an opportunity for gathering the more strength to itself, till it would inevitably overpower and bear away every thing which before impeded its progress, and sweep on, in its wonted course, beyond the power of any control or resistance.

Hence, it appears to your memorialists, to be the solemn duty of every man who fears God, and especially of every minister of the gospel, to turn his attention to this subject; to inform himself in relation to all its parts and bearings; and then, if he is "convinced of the great evil of slavery," as we all profess to be, he will be prepared wisely to give the influence of his example in opposing it, so as to correct, or to avoid the evils which many seem to anticipate with so much certainty, merely by the discussion of this question. But, what is the slavery which prevails in this land and which nearly three millions of our species are now doomed to endure?

We answer, it is the holding and treating of men, women, and children, as property; and for a human being to be thus held and treated, your memorialists believe is a sin against God, for the following reasons, among others:—

1. Because, it refuses to the enslaved the rights of his own reason and conscience. These are rights which God has never given, we believe, any man a right to take away from his fellow-man.

2. Because, it may, and it does, more or less annihilate the marriage state;—it prevents the enslaved parents from obeying the commands of God with regard to their children;—it severs children from the parents to whom they belong;—it prohibits, or nullifies the marriage rights, and prevents those who are husbands and wives (in the sight of heaven) from obeying the commands of God with regard to each other.

3. Because, it originates and sanctions promiscuous intercourse between the sexes of the enslaved; and the great number of mulattoes in the slave states, shows that the system of slave holding is equally corrupting and pernicious in its influence on the whites. Can a God of infinite purity, look with approbation on such a state of things? And does He smile on those of his professed children, who oppose that which is done to bring it to an end?

4. Because, it holds the religious privileges of the enslaved at the mercy of the master, whether that master be an infidel, protestant, or papist. Such power over another, your memorialists believe, the great Creator never gave to any man, or society of men, and hence, to assume it, is to sin against God.

5. Because, it prevents the slave from obeying that command of God, which makes it the duty of all men to "search the Scriptures." And how long shall we censure the papists, for withholding the scriptures from their people, while protestant Christians, in this republic, so far-famed for its freedom, withhold the bible from two millions of heathen in their midst, and give their influence and example in support of those laws which make it a crime, punishable, in some cases, with death, even to attempt to teach a colored person to read it!!!

6. We believe, that holding and treating man as property, is a sin, because it crushes the minds of God's intelligent creatures: For the slave system forbids and prevents all schools for mental instruction. Who can look at an immortal mind, which God has made, and behold it crushed and debased by this system, and say it was no sin in him who did it? But in the contemplation of this subject, we have to look at the condition of hundreds, and thousands, and millions, of immortal minds thus crushed, and withered, and debased from the light of science and religion, and this too by Christians, by ministers of that gospel which proclaims liberty to the captive, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.

7. Because, it unjustly withholds the hire of the laborer. God has said, "The laborer is worthy of his hire;" and it is he who hath also said, "Who unto him that useth his neighbors service without wages, and giveth him not for his work."

8. Because, it sanctions and covers the breach of the eighth commandment. It originates and justifies what the bible calls "man-stealing;" a crime for which the perpetrator, under the Mosaic economy, was doomed to suffer death.

9. And lastly, because it necessarily subjects the enslaved to the sufferance of other and numerous evils, which serve to embitter their existence, and more or less prevent the salvation of their souls. This is what your memorialists believe to be slavery. We do not wish to attempt a description of what are called the abuses of slavery. Slavery itself is an abuse, an evil, a sin. But it may be inquired, what have the people of the north to do with this subject?

In the opinion of your memorialists, the Christian people of the free states have as much to do with it, and more than they have to do with the burning of widows upon the funeral pile in India. We have as much to do with the sin of slavery, which prevails in this nation, as we have to do with the idolatry and sin which prevail in any part of the world to which we send our missionaries to preach the gospel. As Christians, therefore, it is our duty to remember those in bonds, and pray for them; and we should remember those who keep them in bondage and pray for them also.

And as members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, particularly, we have something to do with this subject. It is a fact, that ought not to be lost sight of, that the Methodist Episcopal Church was formed with the express understanding among the members of the conference in 1784, who performed this solemn act, that slavery should not be continued in the church in any form.

Some of the Methodists at that time held slaves, it is true, but when the church was organized, a number of rules were drawn up and adopted, which gave them sufficient time to get rid of them; and they specified also, how this should be done, making these additional rules: "Every person concerned who will not comply with these rules, shall have liberty quietly to withdraw from our society, within the twelve months following the notice being given him as aforesaid. Otherwise the assistant shall exclude him from the society." "No person holding slaves shall, in future, be admitted into society, or to the Lord's table, till he previously comply with these rules concerning slavery." "Those who buy or sell slaves, or give them away, unless on purpose to free them, shall be expelled immediately." See *Lee's History of the Methodists*.

Such were some of the rules with which the church, of which we are members, was organized; but your memorialists dare not say, that they seriously believe, that all the preachers in our church are as much opposed to the "Great evil of Slavery" now, as the Methodist preachers were at the time of which we are speaking. Nor does it seem to your memorialists, that the opposition which is now manifested amongst us, against the Sin of Slavery, is not of moderate. We all know what were the views of the venerable Wesley, upon this subject, nor need we repeat here, those which are found in the writings of Drs. Coke and Clarke, and in the doings of the Wesleyan Conference in England. The opposition which we feel to the sin of slave holding, we know to be co-eval with Methodism, if not with Christianity itself: witness the following extracts from the minutes of the Conference for 1780.

"The Conference acknowledges, that slavery is contrary to the laws of God, man and nature; and hurtful to society, contrary to the dictates of conscience and pure religion; and doing unto others as we would not that others should do unto us." At the same time, the conference passed its "disapprobation upon all the members of society, who held slaves; and advised their freedom." And it is only about 30 years since the Discipline of our church contained the following, among other rules upon this subject. "The Annual Conferences are directed to draw up addresses for the gradual emancipation of the slaves, to the Legislatures of those States in which no general laws have been passed for that purpose. These addresses should urge in the most respectful but pointed manner, the necessity of a law, for the gradual emancipation of the slaves; and proper committees shall be appointed by the Annual Conferences, out of the most respectable of our friends for the conducting of this business; and the Presiding Elders, Elders, Deacons, and Travelling Preachers, shall procure as many proper signatures as possible to the addresses, and give all the assistance in their power, in every respect, to aid the committee, and further this blessed undertaking. Let

this be continued, from year to year, till the desired end be accomplished."

Had the above directions of our Discipline been followed, from the time they were first incorporated into it, till the present time, who can tell but even this year would have brought about this nation's jubilee, and the last captive in the land, ere this been freed from the chains of his oppression.

Your memorialists are aware, that they may be told, after all, as they have already been, that this is a political question, and that ministers and Christians have nothing to do with politics; and ought not, therefore, to identify themselves with the abolition cause.

In reply, your memorialists would say, "the National Assembly of France, in the commencement of the French revolution, appointed a committee to enquire and report, whether there were and ought to be a God; and the committee reported, that there could be no liberty on earth, while there is no God; and that death is an eternal sleep. The Assembly adopted the report, abolished the Sabbath, burnt the Bible, instituted the Decade, and ordained the worship of the Goddess of Liberty in the form of a vile woman." Was not this a political affair? As truly so, as is American Slavery; and your memorialist cannot see, why the same reasoning that proves we have no right, as Christians and ministers, to interfere with slavery, because it is a political question, would not have justified the people of God in France, in giving silent consent, at least, to the horrible atheistical sentiments thus sanctioned in their political capacity, and ordained as the law of the land. It is most painful, to your memorialists, to perceive that the sentiment—that we have nothing to do with slavery, because it is said, it is a political question, has its advocates in the church, whose influence, we think, ought to be exerted in a manner very different from that of turning away the weapons of truth from legalized wickedness. What sin, we beg leave to ask, has ever cursed the world, but what, at some period of time has been legalized, and of course politically sanctioned? The brothels of France may serve as an example. And could our fathers in Israel send their counsel to the faithful Protestants of France, not to make war with licentiousness, not to insist on the strict observance of the seventh commandment, not to denounce the judgments of God on those who transgress it, because the transgression is licensed by the Government? Is constitutional, and of course a political subject!

The same ethics which teach that we have nothing to do with slavery because of its political bearings, your memorialists conceive, would condemn all the ancient prophets and apostles, and indeed Jesus Christ himself, and would consign the Bible to the same fate decreed it, by the Atheists of France—for that wages uncompromising war with all sin, whether it have the sanction of legislative enactment, or be against the civil code of the land.

If the objection be valid, Satan and wicked men might easily place all manner of sin beyond the province of ministerial denunciation:—It needs only to be legalized and the work is done! Shall such a doctrine be sanctioned by the church? We believe, it is condemned by the conduct of every eminent saint of whom we have an account in the word of God. Did they forbear to rebuke sin in every form, although it might be legalized? We answer—No! If this doctrine be true, why did not Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego fall down and worship in obedience to the king's edict? Why did not Daniel cease to pray when the royal decree came forth from Darius? Surely they ought to have done so, according to the theology of those who teach us, that we ought not to interfere with slavery because of its political connections.

Your memorialists beg leave to enquire whether it can seriously be pretended, that that can be called merely a political question which as a system, reduces hum in beings, made in the image of God, to the condition of mere "goods and chattels" to all intents purposes and constructions whatsoever—that dooms to hopeless ignorance more than two millions of human beings and their posterity after them, in the midst of a Christian land! that shuts up the kingdom of God against men, by taking away the key of knowledge, the Bible! Is that wholly a political question, with which Christians and Christian ministers have nothing to do: which sells the temple of the Holy Ghost in the market with horses, mules and swine;—which prevents human beings from obeying God's command to "train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"—which takes away from a million of females the right to obey the commands of a holy God, "Keep yourself pure"—and makes them, in some states, liable to the punishment of death if they "lift their hand against any white man"? Is that wholly a political question, which holds all the religious privileges of deathless spirits at the mercy of a master, whether he be infidel, protestant or papist? Is that a political question merely, which annihilates God's ordinance, marriage, and parts at the will of a mere man, those who in the sight of God, are husband and wife:—which prevents the spread of the Gospel, by prohibiting it under severe penalties; in some cases punishing with death, for instructing a colored person in a Sabbath school,—which reduces two millions of human beings for whom Christ died, to the condition of heathen in the midst of a professedly Christian land! Is such a system a mere political matter?

Were this subject more of a political character than it is, your memorialists cannot conceive how, they, or their brethren, can be released from the moral obligation, binding upon them, to use every power, faculty, and talent, that God has given them, to remove, to the utmost of their power, all the evils that curse the world. We believe, that the command, "Render unto God the things that are God's," is no more binding than that which requires us to "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," and that therefore, in governments like our own, when the elective power is with the people, the people, and of course all Christians, and Christian ministers, are both morally and politically responsible for the legislative acts of their Rulers. Hence, we are concerned, most seriously concerned, with this subject, and so we shall be, and must be, as long as this nation holds a single slave in bonds. There are now no less than 26,000 human beings held in slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories, over which the Congress of these United States, the members of which, are but the servants of the whole people, has "exclusive jurisdiction in all cases whatsoever." The Capitol of this far-famed republic, is made a great slave market, where human flesh and bones, and human souls are bought and sold, like cattle; and the prison, which has been built with the people's money, paid in part, by the free States, is used to carry on this traffic; and hundreds of dollars are paid into the United States Treasury, by slave dealers in the capital, for license to carry on the trade!

Your memorialists repel the insinuation, so often repeated, that we have given countenance, in any way, to insurrections among the slaves, or any resort to physical force for their emancipation; and we avow, that no such measures can receive our countenance than such as are both moral and constitutional.

The following resolutions adopted by the N. H. Conference, at its last session in committee of the whole, will show the sentiments of said Conference on the subject of slavery:—

Resolved 1. That, the holding and treating the human species as property, is a sin against God, and a violation of the inalienable rights of humanity.

Resolved 2. That, ceasing to hold man as property, is the first and most effectual step which can be taken, by the enslaver, towards preparing the enslaved, or the proper use of the rights and privileges of civil and religious society.

Resolved 3. That, as Christians, we are morally responsible for the existence and continuance of slavery in these United States, and in the Christian church especially, and that we will use our Christian endeavors to bring it to a peaceful and speedy termination.

Resolved 4. That, as citizens of the United States, we are responsible for the existence and continuance of Slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories over which the Government of this nation has the control.

The New Hampshire Conference appointed a committee to draft and forward a memorial to the next General Conference on the subject of Slavery. We therefore in the name, and in behalf of said Conference would respectfully pray your venerable body again to give your testimony against this enormous evil, & that you would take such other measures, as may be deemed proper, to free the church and our common country from the dreadful calamities with which its continuance threatens the church and the nation.

J. F. ADAMS,
JARED PERKINS, } Committee.
GEORGE STORRS,

Texas Meeting.

At a very large meeting of the friends of Texas, held pursuant to public notice in the Hall of the Cincinnati College, on Saturday evening, May 7th 1836, on motion of N. C. Read, Esq., Dr. Daniel Drake was appointed President, and Griffin Yeatman, and Isaac G. Burnet, Esqrs., Vice Presidents, and Charles Fox, Esq., Secretary.

The object of the meeting being explained by the President, Col. J. R. Lewis was called for, and addressed the meeting, setting forth the origin of the controversy between the Texans and Mexicans, the situation and prospects of the Texans and their means for continuing the struggle for independence.

On motion—A Committee of three persons, consisting of David T. Disney, N. C. Read and Henry Valette, Esqrs. was appointed to report resolutions for the action of the meeting—who reported the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:—

Resolved, That, as citizens of these free United States, we believe that the time has arrived when it becomes a duty to express our opinion, with regard to the cause and conduct of the inhabitants of Texas.

Resolved, That in our opinion the cause of the inhabitants of Texas, is the cause of civil liberty throughout the world, and that as such it is our duty to sustain them by every means legitimately within our power.

Resolved, That the brutal and inhuman course of Santa Anna, in devoting to massacre every age and sex, is worthy the butcher of the Alamo, and is just cause for declaring him and his co-conspirators without the pale of civil society, while it appeals to every freeman to compel him to such an account as may hereafter stand as a warning to tyrants of every age, and every clime.

Resolved, That it would be unwise and impolitic in our government to remain idle until the flame of savage warfare has actually lit up our southern border; but that it is their duty to anticipate it by a punishment, speedy, and terrible enough to teach the Mexican Government that a second effort of the kind will involve their own destruction.

Resolved, That we believe that our government, in at once arresting the barbarities of the war now raging in Texas, by an immediate and armed interference, would be rendering a service to humanity.

Resolved, That in order to carry the foregoing resolutions into effect, we hereby instruct our Representative in Congress to use his utmost exertions in order to cause our government to interfere immediately and directly in the war now raging in Texas.

Resolved, That we hereby make a solemn and direct appeal to every city, village and neighborhood in the nation, to respond to these declarations.

On motion—Resolved, That a Committee of five citizens be appointed to open and superintend books, for contributions for the aid of Texas, whereupon, David T. Disney, Wm. Greene, John T. Martin, Paul Anderson and Henry Valette, Esqrs. were appointed.—Ordered that said books be opened at the Office of the Ohio Insurance Company.

On motion it was, Resolved, That the thanks of the meeting be returned to Col. Lewis for his instructive and interesting address, and that a committee of three be appointed, to solicit a copy of the same for publication and distribution, whereupon, N. C. Read, Joseph Graham and L. M. Gwynne, Esqrs. were appointed that Committee.

On motion, adjourned.
DANIEL DRAKE, Pres.
Griffin Yeatman, } Vice Pres.
Isaac G. Burnet, }
Charles Fox, Sec'y.

Remarks.

We had intended to say much more on Texas affairs, this week, than we shall be able to do. The above resolutions are, we would hope, the last effort that will be made in this city in favor of the insurgents of a foreign government. It is not to be controverted, that the struggle to tear away from Mexico her most valuable territory, has greatly interested the feelings of many, even of our fellow citizens, who, on other subjects, are judicious and considerate. They do not, we are convinced, look to the probable results of their course, should it be successful. Should the General Government be impelled by the fiery spirits who are striving to stir up a popular sympathy in favor of the Texans, the consequences must be tremendous to the South. We think it not only probable, but altogether certain, should we be brought into warlike conflict with Mexico—that a general servile insurrection in the south must be the result. Would Santa Anna fail to stir up the slaves of Louisiana, where they are now, doubtless, almost double the white population? There is no policy which would restrain him—for in his government all men are free—there are now no slaves to be affected by such an attempt. Suppose Santa Anna was to publish to the people of Mexico some of the foregoing resolutions, changing them only so far as is necessary to make them applicable to our country and to the condition of the southern slaves; what would we say, were he to resolve—that as citizens of the free Republic of Mexico, the time has arrived when it becomes our duty to express our opinion with regard to the cause and conduct of the enslaved inhabitants of the neighboring States of North America, and that in our opinion the cause of the oppressed in those States, is the cause of civil liberty throughout the world, and that as such it is our duty to maintain them by every means legitimately within our power.

What would we say, in case a servile insurrection had begun in Louisiana, and was extending itself through the south—if the colored citizens of Texas and other provinces should assemble, pass resolutions, encouraging the rebels among us; open an office to raise money and munitions of war, and many of them should band into companies, and in the very face of the government march off for the seat of war! And are not these the "means" that the revolutionists of our city have adopted, and are calling "legitimate?" If they be legitimate for us against Mexico—why may they not be equally legitimate for the Mexicans against us in the case supposed? Such "means," we think, would be legitimate for neither. If persisted in, to the point of involving us in a war with Mexico; it will in all probability, break up southern slavery in blood and devastation. To prevent such a catastrophe—to which in every collision with a foreign power, we must whilst we are a slave-holding people, be inevitably exposed—is our object as abolitionists. Should our nation engage in such a conflict, it can never enlist the sympathy of the civilized world in its behalf. Nor will Mexico be alone. That she will quietly submit to dismemberment is not to be expected. Independently of the kind feeling she would excite in the rest of the world by a manly struggle for existence—she is too rich and has too many boons to offer, not to have friends. In an unjust cause—how favorable soever may be the appearances of success, we ought not to look for it. Successful or not in any project of acquisition, by which we might be impelled, we lose our moral influence over the nations. If unsuccessful, we shall be esteemed the basest and most contemptible of nations.

In conclusion, we have to say, that the friends of non-interference in the affairs of Mexico, have great reason to be encouraged at the present aspect of the public mind in our country. So far as we can judge from the papers, from almost every quarter, the people of the United States are beginning to view the Texian enterprise in a proper light.

We know of no man (except James Watson Webb,) who is more lavish in his abuse of the petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, than he who, in 1826, penned the following article.—*Rep. Monitor*.

From the Commercial Advertiser.

"As long as I have a voice to speak, this question shall never be at rest."—*Fox*.

Slavery in the District of Columbia.

We have often been taxed with "all uncharitableness" towards our southern brethren, because we believe the professions of a great majority of the slaveholders, of their anxiety to rid themselves of the evil, in the main to be "false and hollow." There are exceptions to this rule we know. There are numbers of good men, who if they could, we have no doubt would wipe off the dark disgrace of personal slavery from our national character. But these numbers are lamentably few. The great majority of the slaveholders cling to their slaves, with the tenacity that the drowning man clings to the spar thrown to his relief. And they grasp for more with the same avidity with which they grasp for political power. Why the passion evinced by southern statesmen, whenever the subject is broached in Congress, and of southern editors, whenever the discussion is attempted in the northern papers. If you wish to see the President of the Colonization Society, on a recent occasion, sell some thirty of his spare slaves into the still more dreadful slavery of Louisiana, instead of sending them to the favorite colony on the western coast of Africa. The fact is, these professions, if properly scrutinized, will in the main be found hypocritical, as a thousand facts might be cited to prove. We have another, and a very precious piece of testimony of this sort now before us. The case of Horton, the Westchester resolutions, the tone of the northern press, the intended prosecution of the officers of Washington, and the determination to bring the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia before Congress, has attracted their attention. And what do they do? Do they come forward and hail the anticipated freedom of a portion of their fellow men, as a measure calculated to relieve themselves of what, when it suits their convenience, they tell us is a curse? No: far from it—so far from it, indeed, that the Alexandria Gazette is already discussing the question of obtaining a re-election of that part of the District of Columbia back to Virginia—that they may enjoy the precious boon of slavery unmolested! "The measure," says that journal, [of abolishing slavery in that District] "will certainly be agitated; and it is folly to think of suppressing it with a protest, unless backed with something stronger than mere ink and paper."—What does the man mean? He surely forgets which party, in the event of an exertion of physical strength would wield the club of Hercules. But we will not reply further to such language—as we hope it will be long ere such iniquitous threats proceed from the north, and in the mean time we trust that the conductors of the southern papers will learn more prudence, if they do not imbibe sounder and more patriotic principles.

Thus wrote WILLIAM L. STONE, in 1836. Can he look back upon the sentiments he then professed, and compare them with his gross abuse of the abolitionists of the present day, without a feeling of self-abasement at his degeneracy?

Strong Testimony.

With regard to abolition, or rather anti-slavery, we feel bound to state that the cause is on the increase. A few months since, and such was the excitement against Tappan, Garrison, and others, that all attempts to hold a public meeting upon the subject were successfully resisted. Now, however, public meetings are held with impunity—slavery is denounced from the pulpit and the press—and even in Philadelphia, we have a daily paper, the Evening Star, that ventures to take bold and decided ground in favor of the abolitionists. We mention these circumstances merely with the object of showing the progress of public sentiment, and of chronicling the occurrences of the day. It has long been our opinion that the slave question would sooner or later absorb and swallow up all other excitements, and constitute the prominent topic of the scheme. We are the more confirmed in this opinion by recent occurrences.—*Bicknell's (Phil.) Reporter*.

JAMES A. SHEDD,

Attorney and Counsellor at Law,
BAYTON, MONTGOMERY CO., OHIO.
Will promptly attend to any business, in the way of his profession, that may be intrusted to him from abroad.

References—
David Stone, } Dayton.
James Steele, }
George W. Nell, } Cincinnati.
William McLane, }
Newkirk White, & Co, } Philadelphia.
John Gest, }
Wm. Cothel, New-York.
April 1, 1836.—*Ed.*